AN

End to Diſcord;

Wherein is demonſtrated

That no Doctrinal Controverſy remains between the

PRESBYTERIAN

AND

CONGREGATIONAL

Miniſters, fit to juſtify longer Diviſions.

With a true Account of

SOCINIANISM as to the Satisfaction of Chriſt.

By *DANIEL WILLIAMS.*

London, Printed for *John Lawrence* at the Angel, and *Tho. Cockeril* at the Three Legs in the *Poultry*. 1699.

pr 706

EPISTLE
TO THE
READER.

Reader;

IF Arguments *might induce Christians to Peace, 'twere enough to say, nothing is more expresly required than Christian* Concord *by our Lord Jesus, or more commended from its heavenly Original and happy Fruits; nor scarce any thing more warned against as obstructing the Kingdom of Christ, advantageous to Satan's Interest, destructive to Religion, yea Civil Society, repugnant to the very* Design *and* Spirit *of the Gospel, with the mutual usefulness of Men, than uncharitable and dividing Contentions be. The only reason that can be suggested to acquit such Contenders from notorious Guilt must be, that it's for the* Faith of the Gospel *that they contend. But it's worth our serious thoughts, that as even this cannot excuse a rigid, censorious, envenom'd Spirit, or unhallowed Methods in our Struggles for Truth; so no other than a* direct Opposition to the Essentials of some Fundamental Article *can*

warrant Diviſions, or refuſals of Communion on the account of meer difference in the Faith, provided Aſſent *to no real Error is impoſed on us as a* Term of Union.

It's too obvious to require Proof, that if a direct *Oppoſition to what is not fundamental, or to whatever* remotely *belongs to all which is ſo; nay further, if oppoſing by* denied Conſequences *what is of the Eſſence of any fundamental Article of Faith, be a warrant for Separation of Miniſters and Churches from each other, then the* inſtituted Rules *of Chriſtian Fellowſhip do not oblige us: the* approved Inſtances *of Communion in the New Teſtament Churches ought to be condemned, and all the Churches of Chriſt muſt daily be more and more* rended *by Non-communion and dividing Animoſities, until the* Catholick *Church loſe all ſhew of* Unity, *or be reduced to a ſingle Congregation (and that but for an uncertain moment) even when vaſt numbers of* Chriſtian Societies *proclaim the Advancement of our Saviour's Conqueſt.*

Nor is their Folly leſs apparent, who for excuſe of this ſurmiſe that every Error which they ought to rectify in themſelves, and by juſt methods to reform in others, is a bar *to Communion; or yet, that Separation is one of thoſe* juſt *Methods in the caſe fore-mentioned, eſpecially towards ſuch over whom they pretend to no* Authority. *O when will Men ſee that Chriſt's Royal* Prerogative *is aſſumed, when ever* other *Terms of, or Bars to Communion are invented than what he hath expreſly made ſuch, and that in a matter wherein his own Honour and*

his

his People's Intereſt are concerned next to that of Union with himſelf!

But alas! in contempt of Rules ſo neceſſary to the Churches Peace, many Ages are filled with Inſtances of aſſuming a right to account him for a Heathen *who differs but in Trifles, and cannot pronounce their very* Phraſes, *tho ſcrupled becauſe abuſed to ſupport an Error, and the Truth deſigned by them is moſt expreſly owned: a thing ſo thwarting a Chriſtian Temper, that* Athanaſius *and* Bazil *profeſs they would break with none who refuſed the word* ὁμοούσιος, *ſo they would by any words declare their ſoundneſs in the Doctrine of the Trinity; and yet that word had been adjuſted by not a few particular Authors, but the great* Council of Nice, *in oppoſition to the Hereſy of* Arius. *I ſcruple not to ſay, an* Antichriſtian *Spirit moſt effectually extinguiſheth the like Moderation; and ſuch Impoſers entruſted with the* Secular *Sword, would uſe it as they do their* Eccleſiaſtical, *however they condemn Severity while* themſelves *are not the Perſecutors.*

That there have been of late years great Diviſions among the Diſſenters *is too publickly know; I had rather ſhare in the Imputation of an Acceſſory, than perpetuate them by the fulleſt Vindication, hoping that a calm Seaſon will better fit all of us to reflect, and repent of our Faultineſs, eſpecially the* Unchriſtian *management of our Debates, and for which we have great reaſon to pray God would not ſignally contend* hereafter.

But bleſſed be the Name of our God, that e'er we be quite devoured *by each other, a fit*

occaſion is miniſtred for our healing; and tho ſelf-preſervation hath been my work ever ſince my temperate Confutation of Dr. Criſp, *(and then too) none will wonder I take hold of this Opportunity to evidence that further Conteſts will be inexcuſable: nor is it a hard Province when the* united Miniſters *and* Congregational *Brethren have ſo far acquitted themſelves: The* firſt *by ſundry former Accounts (and now more enlarged from any word in which I cannot ſuſpect two will differ) of their Vindication from Errors concerning the* Satisfaction *of Chriſt, and* Juſtification, *which are the only Points objected. The laſt by their* Declaration againſt Antinomian Errors, *for which I am too thankful to remark its Stings; and had it come out before my* Poſtſcript, *I durſt not have repreſented their Judgment by the Conſequences of their Objections (however natural) as in ſome few things is done. That the* God of Peace *would give us Peace, is the unfeigned Prayer of*

Thy Servant in the Goſpel, and Brother in the Kingdom and Patience of our Lord Jeſus,

Daniel Williams.

Note, The Edition of the Works of *Socinus*, &c. to which I refer, is that printed in *Folio* at *Irenopoli*, 1656.

INTRO-

INTRODUCTION.

AS the too visible Progress of *Antinomianism* grieved us, and obliged our Defence of the Truth, and a Gospel-Ministry: so we must rejoice in the *Congregational Ministers Declaration against Antinomian Errors*, well knowing the infected will more regard the Judgment of these Brethren, because of their Agreement with them in matters of Church-Discipline.

We are sorry they were not a little sooner prevailed with to give this Testimony; for then we had not been forced in *the Answer to the Report*, to hint some of the Reasons inducing us to think many of them espoused, and the generality of them in this City too much countenanced *Antinomianism*, with its open Abettors. Nor dare we indulge a Temper so devilish, as for Party-sake to repine at these Brethren acquitting themselves from those imputed Errors: But on the contrary, we gladly endeavour to procure Peace by this *Declaration* of theirs; for which desirable end, we shall overlook all the Reflections contained therein against us; and not refuse to acquit our selves once more from all *hurtful Errors concerning Christ's Satisfaction, and our Justification* (altho so fully and often done here-

tofore, that our Brethrens Inſinuation to the contrary doth not a little ſurprize us) and, which is principally aimed at, we hope it will appear, that in all that's *material*, both our Brethren agree with us in our Teſtimony againſt *Antinomianiſm*; and we agree with them in a diſapproval of the other Extreams. To evidence which we ſhall repeat, 1. Our Teſtimony againſt Dr. *Criſp*'s Errors, when ſo many were indangered by his *reprinted* Books. 2. Some part of our former Declarations againſt *Popiſh*, *Socinian* and *Arminian* Errors, when our Brethren accuſed us thereof for ſubſcribing the foreſaid Teſtimony againſt *Criſpianiſm*. 3. We ſhall give an account of our Congregational Brethrens *Declaration againſt Antinomian Errors*. 4. We ſhall evidence that this taken together and examined with Candor, ought to be acknowledged a ſufficient Vindication of the Approvers thereof from all *hurtful Antinomian* Errors. 5. We ſhall add our further Teſtimony againſt Errors about Chriſt's Satisfaction and Juſtification. If Peace at leaſt muſt not be allowed us after this, we muſt bewail a judicial ſtroke, and expect to be deſpiſed by ſuch who perceive our common hurt from theſe Debates, but have not Judgment to diſtinguiſh between the injured Seekers of Peace, and the injurious Fomenters of Trouble.

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

The State of Truth and Errors (ſubſcribed by near fifty of us) drawn up and publiſhed by Mr. Williams, *in a Book called,* Goſpel-Truth ſtated and vindicated, *firſt Edition*; Anno 16. 1692.

Truth 1. IT is *certain* from God's Decree of Election, that the Elect ſhall in time be juſtified, adopted, and ſaved in *the way* God hath appointed; and the *whole* meritorious Cauſe and Price of Juſtification, Adoption, and Eternal Life, were perfect, when Chriſt *finiſhed* the Work of Satisfaction. Nevertheleſs, the Elect *remain* Children of Wrath, and ſubject to Condemnation, *till* they are effectually called by the Operation of the Spirit.

Error. The Elect are at *no time* of their Lives under the Wrath of God, nor are they ſubject to Condemnation if they ſhould die *before* they believe; yea, when they are under the Dominion of Sin, and in the Practice of the groſſeſt Villanies, they are *as much* the Sons of God, and juſtified, as the very Saints in Glory.

Truth 2. Tho *our Sins* were imputed to Chriſt with reſpect to the *Guilt* thereof, ſo that he, by the Father's Appointment, and his own Conſent, became obliged, as Media-

tor, to bear the *Puniſhments* of our Iniquities; and he did bear thoſe Puniſhments to the *full Satisfaction of Juſtice*, and to our actual Remiſſion when we believe; nevertheleſs, the *Filth* of our Sins was not laid upon Chriſt; nor can he be called the Tranſgreſſor, or was he in God's account the Blaſphemer, Murderer, *&c.*

Error. God did not only impute the Guilt, and lay the Puniſhment of the Sins of the Elect upon Chriſt; but he laid all the very Sins of the Elect upon Chriſt, and that, as to their *real Filthineſs and Loathſomneſs*; yea, ſo, that Chriſt was *really* the Blaſphemer, Murderer, and Sinner, and ſo accounted by the Father.

Truth 3. The Atonement made by Chriſt, by the Appointment of God, is that *for which alone* the Elect are pardoned, when it is applied to them. But the Elect are not immediately pardoned upon Chriſt's being appointed to ſuffer for them, nor as ſoon as the Atonement was made; nor is that Act of laying Sins on Chriſt, God's forgiving Act, by which we are *perſonally diſcharged.*

Error. The very Act of God's laying Sins on Chriſt upon the Croſs, is the very *actual diſcharge* of all the Elect from all their Sins.

Truth 4. An Elect Perſon ceaſeth not to be a Sinner upon the laying of our Sins upon Chriſt; that is, he remains a Sinner, as to the *Guilt*, till he believes, if Adult. He is a Sinner, as to the *Filth* of Sin, till he be ſanctified. He is a Sinner, as to the charge of the ſinful *Fact* he commits, and that even after Pardon

Pardon and Sanctification: Nevertheleſs, he is free from the *Curſe* when he is pardoned, and ſhall be purged from all the Filth of Sin when he is perfect in Holineſs. And tho Chriſt did bear the Puniſhment of our Iniquity, yet it never was Chriſt's Iniquity, but *ours*.

Error. The Elect upon the Death of Chriſt ceaſed to be Sinners, and *ever ſince* their Sins are none of *their* Sins, but they are the Sins of *Chriſt*.

Truth 5. The *Obligation* of ſuffering for our Sins was upon Chriſt, from his undertaking the Office of a Mediator, to the moment wherein he finiſhed his ſatisfactory Atonement. The *Puniſhment* of our Sins lay upon Chriſt from the firſt moment, to the laſt of his ſtate of Humiliation.

Error. The time when our Sins were laid *actually* on Chriſt, was when he was nailed to the Croſs, and God actually forſook him; and they continued on him *till* his Reſurrection.

Truth 6. Tho God teſtified his threatned *Indignation* againſt Sin, in the awful Sufferings of Chriſt's *Soul* and Body in his Agony, and ſuſpended thoſe *delightful* Communications of the Divine Nature to the Human Nature of Chriſt, as to their wonted Degrees; yet God was never *ſeparated* from Chriſt, much leſs during his Body's lying in the Grave; neither was the Father ever diſpleaſed with Chriſt, and far leſs did he *abhor* him, becauſe of the *Filthineſs* of Sin upon him.

Error.

Error. Christ was on the account of the *Filthiness* of Sins, while they lay upon him, *separated* from God, *odious* to him, and even the Object of God's *Abhorrence*, and this to the time of his Resurrection.

Truth 7. The Mediatorial Righteousness of Christ is so imputed to true Believers, as that for the sake thereof they are pardoned and accepted unto Life eternal; it being reckoned to them, and *pleadable* by them for these Uses, as if they had personally done and suffered what Christ did as Mediator *for* them, whereby they are delivered from the Curse, and no other Atonement nor meriting Price of saving Benefits can be demanded from them. Nevertheless, this Mediatorial Righteousness is not subjectively in them; nor is there a Change of Person betwixt them and Christ, neither are they as righteous as he; but there remain Spots and Blemishes in them, until Christ by his Spirit perfect that Holiness begun in all true Believers, which he will effect before he bring them to Heaven. *See the* 2d *Truth, and note, it is only Dr.* Crisp's *Change of Person is denied*, viz. *a perfect Change which makes us as righteous as he*, &c. *but not Christ's dying in our stead, which in this Book is oft asserted.*

Error. Every Believer, or elect Person, is as righteous as Christ, and there is a *perfect* Change of Person and Condition betwixt Christ and the Elect; he was what we are, *viz.* as sinful as we; and we are what he was, *viz.* perfectly holy, and without Spot or Blemish.

Truth

Truth 8. *I ſhall expreſs it in the words of the Aſſembly.* The Grace of God is manifeſted in the *ſecond Covenant*, in that he freely provideth, and offereth to Sinners a Mediator, and Life and Salvation by him, requiring Faith as the *Condition* to intereſt them in him; promiſeth and giveth his holy Spirit to all his Elect to work in them that Faith, with all other ſaving Graces; and to enable them unto all Obedience, as the Evidence of the Truth of their Faith and Thankfulneſs to God, and as the way which he hath appointed them to Salvation.

Note, Reader, that theſe Divines do here join together the Covenant of Redemption with Chriſt, and the Goſpel-Covenant whereby are diſpenſed to us the Benefits impetrated by Chriſt; which two diſtinguiſhed would lead to clearer thoughts.

Error. The *Covenant of Grace* hath *no Condition* to be performed on Man's part, tho in the ſtrentgh of Chriſt: Neither is *Faith* it ſelf the Condition of this Covenant; but all the ſaving Benefits of this Covenant, are actually ours *before* we are born: Neither are we *required* ſo much as to believe, that we may come to have an Intereſt in the Covenant-*Benefits.*

Truth 9. *I ſhall expreſs this in the words of the Aſſembly, and Congregational Elders at the* Savoy (*Confeſ. of Faith*, ch. 14. 2. & *Declarat.* ch. 14. a. 2. of *ſaving Faith:*) By this Grace, a Chriſtian believeth to be true whatever is revealed in the Word, for the Authority of God ſpeaking therein; and *acteth* diffe-

differently upon that which *each* particular Paſſage thereof containeth; yielding Obedience to the Commands, trembling at the Threatnings, and embracing the Promiſes of God for this Life, and that which is to come. But the principal Acts of ſaving Faith, are *accepting*, *receiving*, and *reſting* upon Chriſt alone for Juſtification, *Sanctification*, and Eternal Life, by *virtue* of the Covenant of Grace.

Error. *Saving Faith* is nothing but our *Perſuaſion*, or abſolute concluding within our ſelves, that our Sins are pardoned, and that Chriſt is ours.

Truth 10. Chriſt is freely *offered* to be a Head and Saviour to the *vileſt* Sinners, who will knowingly aſſent to the Truth of the Goſpel, and from a Conviction of their Sin and Miſery out of Chriſt, are humbled, and *truly willing* to renounce all their Idols and Sins; denying their own *carnal* Self and Merits, and accept of Chriſt as offered in the Goſpel; relying on him alone for Juſtification, Sanctification, and Eternal Life.

Error. Chriſt is offered to Blaſphemers, Murderers, and the worſt of Sinners, that they *remaining* ignorant, unconvinced, unhumbled, and reſolved in their purpoſe to continue ſuch, they may be aſſured they have a full Intereſt in Chriſt, and this by *only concluding* in their own Minds upon this Offer, that Chriſt is theirs.

Truth 11. Every Man is without Chriſt, or not *united* to Chriſt, until he be effectually called; but when by this Call the Spirit of God

God enclineth and enableth him willingly to accept of Chriſt as a Head and Saviour, a Man becomes *united* to him, and Partaker of thoſe Influences and Privileges which are peculiar to the Members of the Lord Jeſus.

Error. All the Elect are *actually united* to Chriſt, before they have the Spirit of Chriſt, or at all believe in him, even before they are born; yea, and againſt their Will.

Truth 12. Tho Faith be no way a meritorious Cauſe of a Sinner's Juſtification, yet God hath promiſed to juſtify all ſuch as truly believe, and requires Faith as an indiſpenſible Qualification in all whom he will juſtify for Chriſt's Merits; declaring, that Unbelief ſhall not only hinder Mens *knowing* that they are juſtified, but that it is a bar to any Perſon's *being* juſtified *while* he continues an Unbeliever.

Error. The *whole* uſe of Faith in Juſtification, is only to *manifeſt* that we were juſtified before; and Faith is no way neceſſary to bring a Sinner into a juſtified State, nor *at all uſeful* to that end.

In a Digreſſion there about Repentance *is added.*

Truth. Altho neither Faith nor Repentance be any part of the meriting Righteouſneſs for which we are juſtified, and the Habits of both are wrought at the ſame time, and included in the Regenerating Principle; and there muſt be an aſſenting Act of Faith before there be any exerciſe of true Repentance: And Repentance as conſiſting in the fruits meet

meet for it, *viz.* an external Reformation and a fruitful Life, muſt follow Pardon, as doth alſo an ingenuous Sorrow for Sin in the ſenſe of Pardon: Nevertheleſs, Repentance, as it conſiſts in ſome degree of Humblings and Sorrow from Convictions of our loſt State, and the Evil of Sin, with a ſincere purpoſe of Heart to turn from our Sin and Idols to God, is abſolutely neceſſary in order to the forgiveneſs of Sin.

Error. Our Sins are forgiven before any Repentance; and Believers ought not to complain, or mourn, or ſorrow for the Sins they have committed.

Truth 13. Tho neither Holineſs, ſincere Obedience, or good Works, do make any *Atonement* for Sin; or are in the leaſt the *meritorious Righteouſneſs* whereby Salvation is cauſed, or for which this, or any Bleſſing becomes *due to us as of Debt*; yet as the Spirit of Chriſt freely worketh all Holineſs in the Soul, and enableth us to ſincere Obedience and good Works; ſo the Lord Jeſus hath *of Grace*, and for his own Merits promiſed to bring to Heaven ſuch as are Partakers of true Holineſs, perform this ſincere Obedience, and do theſe good Works perſeveringly, and appoints theſe as the Way and Means of a Believer's obtaining Salvation, and ſeveral other Bleſſings; *requiring* theſe as indiſpenſible Duties and Qualifications of all ſuch whom he will ſo ſave and bleſs, and *excluding* all that want or neglect them, or live under the Power of what's contrary there-

thereto, *viz.* Profaneneſs, Rebellion, and utter Unfruitfulneſs.

Error. Men have nothing to do *in order* to Salvation, nor is Sanctification a jot the *way* of any Perſon to Heaven; nor can the Graces or Duties of Believers, no, nor *Faith* it ſelf do them the *leaſt* Good, or prevent the leaſt Evil; nor are they of any uſe to their *Peace* or Comfort; yea, tho Chriſt be *explicitely* owned, and they be done in the ſtrength of the Spirit of God. And a Believer ought not to think he is more *pleaſing* to God by any Grace he acteth, or Good he doth; nor may Men *expect any Good* to a Nation by the Humiliation, earneſt Prayer, or Reformation of a People.

Truth 14. Tho we ought to intend *God's Glory* as our ſupream End in all our Duties, and deſign therein the expreſſing our Love and *Gratitude* to God for his Benefits, with a great regard *to publick* Good: Yet we alſo lawfully may, and ought to ſtrive after Grace, grow in it, and perform holy Duties and Services, with an *Eye to*, and *Concern for* our own ſpiritual and eternal Advantage.

Error. No Man ought to propoſe to himſelf *any Advantage* by any Religious Duty he performeth, nor ought he in the *leaſt* to intend the Profit of his own Soul by any Chriſtian Endeavours; it being vain and unlawful to do any thing with an Eye to our *ſpiritual* or *eternal Good*, tho in *Subordination* to God's Glory in Chriſt.

Truth 15. The *ordinary* way whereby a Man attaineth a well-grounded Aſſurance, is not

not by *immediate* objective Revelation, or an inward Voice ſaying, *Thy Sins are forgiven thee:* But when the Believer is *examining* his Heart and Life by the *Word*, the holy Spirit *enlightens* the Mind there to diſcern Faith, and Love, and ſuch other Qualifications which the Goſpel declareth to be infallible *ſigns* of Regeneration: And he adds ſuch *Power* to the Teſtimony of *Conſcience* for the Truth and In-being of theſe Graces, as begets in the Soul a joyful ſenſe of its reconciled State; and ſome comfortable freedom from thoſe Fears which accompany a doubting Chriſtian; and according to the *Evidence* of theſe Graces, Aſſurance is *ordinarily* ſtrong or weak.

Error. Aſſurance is not attained by the *Evidence* of Scripture-Marks or *Signs* of Grace, or by the Spirit's *diſcovering* to us that he hath wrought in our Hearts any holy Qualifications: But Aſſurance comes *only* by an inward *Voice* of the Spirit ſaying, *Thy Sins are forgiven thee*, and our believing *thereupon* that our Sins are forgiven.

Truth 16. The Sins of Believers have the *loathſomneſs* of Sin adhering to them, which God *ſeeth*, and accounteth the *Committers* guilty thereby: and they ought to charge *themſelves* therewith, ſo as to ſtir up themſelves to Repentance, and renew their Actings of Faith on Chriſt for Forgiveneſs. Nevertheleſs, they ought not thereby to fear their being out of a juſtified *State*, further than their Falls give them *juſt* cauſe of ſuſpecting that Sin hath *Dominion* over them; and that their

their *firſt* believing on Chriſt was not *ſincere.*

Error. God *ſeeth no Sin* in Believers, tho he ſee the *Fact*; neither doth *He* charge them with any Sin; nor ought they to charge *themſelves* with any Sin, nor be at all ſad for them; nor confeſs, repent, or do any thing as a *Means* of their Pardon; no, nor in order to *aſſuring* themſelves of Pardon, even when they commit Murder, Adultery, or the *groſſeſt* Wickedneſs.

Truth 17. It's true of *Believers*, that if Sin ſhould have *Dominion* over them, they would thereby be ſubject to Condemnation: And tho the Grace of God will *prevent* the Dominion of Sin in every elect Believer, and ſo keep them from *eternal* Death; yet true Believers may by Sin bring great *hurt* upon themſelves in Soul and Body, which they ought to *fear*; and they may expect a ſhare in *National* Judgments, according as they have contributed to common Guilt.

Error. The *groſſeſt* Sins that Believers can commit, cannot do them the *leaſt harm*; neither ought they to *fear* the leaſt hurt by their own Sins, nor by *National* Sins; yea, tho themſelves have had a hand therein.

Truth 18. Tho God is not ſo *angry* with his People for their Sins, as to caſt them out of his *Covenant*-favour; yet by their Sins he is ſo *diſpleaſed*, as for them to *correct* his Children, tho he ſpeaks *Inſtructions* by his Rebukes.

Error. None of the Afflictions of Believers have in them the leaſt of God's *Diſpleaſure* againſt their Perſons for their Sins.

Truth

Truth 19. Tho the preſent ſincere Holineſs of Believers be not perfect, according to the *Precepts* of the Word; nor valuable by the *Sanction* of the Law of Innocency; nor any Atonement for our Defects; and we *ſtill* need Forgiveneſs and the Merits of Chriſt, for *Acceptance* thereof; yet as far as it prevails it's lovely in it ſelf, and pleaſing to God, and is not *Dung or Filth.*

Error. The *greateſt* Holineſs in Believers, tho wrought in them by the *Holy Ghoſt*, is meer *Dung*, Rottenneſs and Filthineſs as in *them.*

Truth 20. *Goſpel-preaching* is when the Meſſengers of Chriſt do publiſh to fallen Sinners the good News of Salvation by Chriſt, to be *obtained* in the way which he hath appointed in his Word, *freely* offering Salvation on his Terms, earneſtly perſwading and commanding Men in the Name of Chriſt, to comply with thoſe Terms, as ever they would eſcape the Miſery they are under, and poſſeſs the Benefits he hath purchaſed; directing all to look to him for *Strength*, and acknowledg him as the only Mediator, and his Obedience and Sufferings as the *ſole* Atonement for Sin, and *meriting* Cauſe of all Bleſſings; inſtructing them in all revealed Truth, and by Goſpel-Motives, urging them to obey the whole Will of God, as a Rule of Duty, but eſpecially to be ſincere and upright, preſſing after Perfection.

Error. Goſpel-Preaching is to teach Men they were *as much* pardoned, and as acceptable to God always, as when they are regenerate;

rate; and while they were ungodly, they had the *ſame* Intereſt in God and Chriſt as when they believe; neither can Sin any way hinder their Salvation, or their Peace; nor have they any thing to do to further either of them, Chriſt having done all for them, and given himſelf to them, before any holy Qualification or Endeavour.

Truth 21. *Legal Preaching* is to preach the Law as a Covenant of Innocency, *or Works*; or to preach the *Moſaick* or Jewiſh Covenant of Peculiarity: But it is not Legal Preaching, to require and perſwade to Faith, Holineſs or Duties, by Promiſes and Threatnings, according to the *Grace of the Goſpel*, and direct Men to *fear and hope* accordingly.

Error. Legal Preaching is to call People to act any Grace, or do any Duty, as a required *Means* of Salvation, or inward Peace; or to *threaten* them with Death, or any Affliction, to cauſe *Fear* if they commit the groſſeſt Sins, and backſlide, and fall away; or to *promiſe* them any Bleſſing upon their Obedience to the Commandments of Chriſt, or urge the Threatnings, to *perſwade* Sinners to believe and repent.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

A Renunciation of ſundry Errors, Anno 1696. *A Paper called*, The ſecond Paper, 1696. *A Propoſal made by us*, 1697.

ALtho we hoped the Caution uſed in the foreſaid *State of Truth and Error*, would prevent the Imputation of *Socinianiſm*, and other hurtful Errors; yet finding our Brethren diſſatisfied, we ſubſcribed with them, *Anno* 1692. (about ſeven Months after the *State of Truth* was publiſhed) certain Doctrinal Propoſitions collected out of the *Aſſembly's Confeſſion*, which we printed *Anno* 1693. with this Title, *An Agreement in Doctrinals*, &c. but that being too long to be here inſerted, we ſhall confine our ſelves to the more material Parts of what further Account we have given of our Judgment concerning the Doctrines of *Satisfaction and Juſtification*, which may be ſeen at large in our *Anſwer to the Report*, p. 3, 11, 27, 33, *&c.*

Anno 1694. In a Paper ſent to our Congregational Brethren it's thus declared:

We the *united Miniſters* in and about *London*, do renounce and teſtify againſt theſe following Opinions.

1. That there is no definite number of Perſons *elected* from all Eternity, whom God will

will by his appointed Means *certainly* ſave, and bring to Eternal Life; leaving the reſt who fall under a juſt Condemnation for their Original and Actual Sins, eſpecially for their Neglect and Contempt of the Means of Salvation.

2. That Chriſt died *equally* for all Men, not intending the final Salvation of ſome more than others.

3. That Men have in their own Power, by the uſe of the natural Faculties of their Reaſon and Will, *unaſſiſted* by the ſpecial Light and Grace of the Holy Ghoſt, to perform all that is neceſſary to Salvation; or that his ſpecial efficacious Light and Grace is not neceſſary to their Converſion, Perſeverance, and final Salvation.

4. That any of them whom God hath foreknown, predeſtinated, and called effectually according to the purpoſe of his Grace, ſhall fall away either totally, or ſo as not to be finally glorified.

5. That Faith, Repentance, a holy Converſation, or any Act or Work whatever done by us, or wrought by the Spirit of God in us, are any part of that Righteouſneſs, for the ſake of which, or on the account whereof, God doth juſtify any Man, or entitle him to Eternal Life.

Then follows a Teſtimony againſt the other Extreams, *viz.* Antinomian Errors.

Again, *Anno* 1696. in a Paper (call'd *The ſecond Paper*) ſent to our Brethren, we thus give our ſenſe.

1. *Con-*

1. *Concerning Juſtification:* That altho the expreſs Word of God doth aſſert the neceſſity of Regeneration to our entring into the Kingdom of God, and require Repentance that our Sins may be blotted out, and Faith in Chriſt, that we may be juſtified, and Holineſs of Heart and Life, without which we cannot ſee God; yet that none of theſe, or any Work done by Men, or wrought by the Spirit of God in them, is, under any Denomination whatſoever, any part of the Righteouſneſs, for the ſake, or on the account whereof God doth pardon, juſtify, or accept Sinners, or entitle them to Eternal Life, that being only the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt without them imputed to them, and received by Faith alone.

2. *Of a Commutation of Perſons* between Chriſt and us: As we are to conſider our Lord Jeſus Chriſt in his Obedience and Sufferings, as God and Man, inveſted with the Office of Mediator; ſo it is apparent this Commutation of Perſons with us was not natural in reſpect of either Nature, by which his individual Subſtance ſhould become ours, and ours his; nor moral, in reſpect of Qualities or Actions, whereby he ſhould become inherently ſinful, and we immediately ſinleſs; nor was it any change whereby his Office of Mediator ſhould be transferred on us, but it is to be underſtood in a legal or judicial ſenſe, as we may call it, *viz.* He by Agreement between the Father and him, came into our room and ſtead, not to repent and believe for us, which the Goſpel requires of

of us as our Duty, tho he hath undertaken the Elect ſhall in due time be enabled thereto, but to anſwer for our Violation of the Law of Works, he being *made Sin for us, that knew no Sin; that we might be made the Righteouſneſs of God in him:* 2 Cor. 5. 21.

3. *Of God's being pleaſed or diſpleaſed with Chriſt as ſtanding and ſuffering in our ſtead.* We judg that God was always pleaſed with Chriſt both in his Perſon, and Execution of all his Offices, which is expreſt moſt particularly in that of his Prieſtly, *John* 10. 17, 18. *Therefore doth my Father love me, becauſe I lay down my Life*; and no otherwiſe diſpleaſed than as having a diſpaſſionate Will to inflict upon him the Puniſhment of our Sins, which he had undertaken to bear, that God might, without Injury to his Juſtice or Honour, pardon and ſave penitent Believers for his Satisfaction and Interceſſion founded thereon.

Note, It was declared, that by the words [*under any Denomination*] we exclude all Righteouſneſs from being meritorious, or atoning, yea, or a procuring Cauſe of theſe Benefits; none is at all ſo but the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt: But we intended not to exclude what the Goſpel requireth in order to our Intereſt in thoſe Benefits given for the ſake of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs.

We alſo in 1697, *delivered our Judgment in this Propoſal to our Brethren.*

1. That Repentance towards God is commanded in order to the Remiſſion of Sins.

2. That Faith in Chriſt is commanded by the Goſpel, in order to the Juſtification of our Perſons before God, for the ſake of the alone Righteouſneſs of Chriſt. 3. That the Word of God requires Perſeverance in true Faith and Holineſs, that we may be Partakers of the Heavenly Glory. 4. That the Goſpel promiſeth Pardon through the Blood of Chriſt to the Penitent, Juſtification before God to the Believer, and the Heavenly Glory to ſuch as perſevere in Faith and Holineſs; and alſo declareth that God will not pardon the Impenitent, juſtify the Unbeliever, nor glorify the Apoſtate or Unholy. 5. That juſtifying Faith is not only a Perſwaſion of the Underſtanding, but alſo a receiving and reſting upon Chriſt alone for Salvation. 6. That by Change of Perſon, is meant, that whereas we were condemned for our Sins, the Lord Jeſus was *ſubſtituted* in our room to bear the Puniſhment of our Sins for the Satisfaction of Divine Juſtice, that whoever believes on him may be acquitted and ſaved; but it is not intended that the Filth of Sin was upon Chriſt, nor that he was a Criminal in God's account. 7. That by Chriſt being our Surety, is meant, that Jeſus Chriſt our Mediator obliged himſelf to expiate our Sins by his Blood, and to purchaſe eternal Life for all that believe, and Faith and every ſaving Grace for the Elect; but it's not intended that we were legally reputed to make Satisfaction, or purchaſe eternal Life. 8. That by Chriſt's anſwering for us the Obligations of the violated Law of Works, is intended, that whereas

as the Law obliged us to die for our Sins, Chriſt became obliged to die in our ſtead; and whereas we were after we had ſinned ſtill obliged to yield perfect Obedience, Chriſt perfectly obeyed the Law, that upon the account of his Active and Paſſive Obedience Believers might be forgiven, and entituled to eternal Life; but it is not intended that the ſenſe of the Law of Works ſhould be, that if we, or Chriſt obey'd, we ſhould live, and if Chriſt ſuffered we ſhould not die, tho we ſinned; nor that Believers are juſtified, or to be judged by the Law of Works, but by the Goſpel; altho the Righteouſneſs for the ſake of which they are juſtified, be as perfect as that Law of Works required, and far more *valuable*.

CHAP. III.

The State of Truth and Error publiſhed in the Congregational Miniſters Declaration againſt Antinomian Errors, about December 1698.

Error 1. THat the eternal Decree gives ſuch an Exiſtence to the Juſtification of the Elect, as makes their Eſtate whilſt in Unbelief, to be the ſame as when they do believe, in all reſpects ſave only as to the *Manifeſtation*; and that there is no other Juſtification by Faith, but what is in their *Conſciences*.

Error 2. That the Elect conſidered as in their natural Eſtate, or as in the firſt *Adam*, are not under the denunciation of *Wrath* by the Law, as well as other Unbelievers and impenitent Sinners.

Truth 1. That there is a difference between the ſtate of the Elect whilſt in Unbelief and when Believers, beſides what is manifeſtative to their Conſciences, *p.* 13.

Truth 2. That before they believe they are not *perſonally* and actually juſtified in the Court of Heaven, *p.* 13. and none may expect to be pardoned in a ſtate of Unbelief and Impenitence, *p.* 47.

Error 3. That pardoned Sin is no Sin, and therefore God cannot ſee Sin in his People to be *diſpleaſed* with them for their Sins; nor doth God expreſs his Fatherly Diſpleaſure againſt them by any Afflictions laid upon them.

Truth. That pardoned, yea mortified Sins are truly and properly Sins; and God *ſeeth* the Sins of his own People, and is *diſpleaſed* with them *for* their Sins.

Error 4. That Believers are not bound to confeſs or mourn over Sin, as committed by them, or pray for pardon of Sin, in making a daily acknowledgment of a need of it, becauſe it was pardoned before committed; and pardoned Sin is no Sin.

Truth. That when Believers do ſin, it is their Duty to humble themſelves, confeſs their Sins, and pray for Pardon, *p.* 19.

Error 5. That Believers ought not to be afraid of committing Sin, becauſe their Sins can do them no hurt.

Truth.

Truth. The Sins of Believers do hurt them, and they ſhould be afraid to commit them, ſeeing they impair their Graces and Comforts, harden their Hearts, wound their Conſciences, hurt and ſcandalize others, grieve God's holy Spirit, expoſe to his Fatherly Diſpleaſure, and bring temporal Judgments upon them, *p.* 22.

Error 6. That they muſt do no good Work or Duty for their own Benefit, or with an Eye to their own Salvation.

Truth. That Believers muſt do good Works, expecting Bleſſings in the performance thereof, *p.* 24.

Error 7. Believers not having in themſelves an Ability to do good Works, are not bound to perform any good Duty, unleſs excited thereunto by a ſpecial motion of the Spirit.

Truth. Tho Believers Ability to do good Works is not at all in themſelves, but wholly from the Spirit of Chriſt, yet are they not hereupon to grow negligent, as if they were not bound to perform any Duty unleſs upon a ſpecial motion of the Spirit, but they ought to be diligent in ſtirring up the Grace of God that is in them, *p.* 27.

Error 8. That Sanctification evidenced by the Spirit of God to their Conſciences, is not a Sign, Mark, or Evidence of their Juſtification; and that Marks and Signs for the trial of a Believer's Faith are of no uſe: for Faith lying in a full perſwaſion and aſſurance that their Perſons were actually juſtified and pardoned in Chriſt, it is a Sin to queſtion, Whether they do ſavingly believe or no?

Truth. Saving Faith lieth not in a full *perſwaſion* and aſſurance that our Sins are actually pardoned; but *Marks* and *Signs* for the trial of our ſpiritual Eſtate are uſeful, and to be ſought after; and Sanctification evidenced by the Spirit of God to our Conſciences is a certain ſign and mark of Sanctification, *p.* 28, 29.

Error 9. That Goſpel Miniſters are not to preach the Law in its Commands and Curſes to convince Men of their need of Chriſt, nor are Believers obliged to regard the Law as delivered by *Moſes*, nor as externally propounded; nor are they bound when they commit Sin to look to the Law for further Diſcoveries and Convictions of the remaining Corruptions that are in them, becauſe by the Goſpel its Obligations are diſſolved.

Truth. That the Law delivered by *Moſes* continues in its Commands and Curſes undiſſolved; and it's ſtill of uſe to *convince* of Sin, that we may ſee a need of Chriſt, and therefore is to be preached and externally propounded, and we are to look unto it, *p.* 36. And tho there is no Sin ſo ſmall but it deſerves Damnation, yet there is no Sin ſo great that it ſhall bring Damnation to them that truly *repent*, which makes the conſtant *preaching* of Repentance neceſſary.

Error 10. That Miniſters of the Goſpel ought not to propound the *Offers* of Salvation unto all thoſe to whom God calls them to preach, ſeriouſly inviting them to improve the Means of Grace that they may be ſaved, and aſſuring them in the way of their Miniſterial

niſterial Duty, of the Salvation of all ſuch as believe in Chriſt, becauſe they want Ability to cloſe with the Offer, and all ſhall not be ſaved.

Truth. That tho Men want Ability to believe ſavingly, yet it's the Duty of Goſpel-Miniſters to make the Offer, and teſtify unto them that whoever believes and repents ſhall be ſaved; and that it's the Peoples Duty to make uſe of their natural Faculties with ſuch external Means and workings of the Spirit as God affords them, that they may believe, repent and be ſaved, *p.* 41, 42.

Error 11. That by God's laying our Sins upon Chriſt, he became every way as ſinful as we, and we every way as righteous as he; and that therefore Perſons may expect to be pardoned whilſt they continue in a ſtate of Unbelief and Impenitence; and that continued Repentance and Holineſs are not in the nature of the thing, nor, by the Conſtitution of the Goſpel, neceſſary to our being poſſeſſed of eternal Life.

Truth. Our Sins were not laid upon Chriſt ſo as to make him every way as ſinful as we, and we are not every way as righteous as Chriſt; and none may expect to be pardoned in a ſtate of Unbelief and Impenitence; and continued Repentance and Holineſs are neceſſary to our poſſeſſion of eternal Life, *p.* 46, 47, 48.

CHAP. IV.

It's made evident, that this Declaration of our Brethren taken altogether, and examined with due Charity and Candor, ought to be acknowledged a ſufficient Vindication of the Approvers thereof from all hurtful Antinomian Errors.

TO this end, 1. We think that Chriſtian Charity and Candor oblige us to judg of what they have declared by theſe following Rules, and we expect the ſame for our ſelves from them. 1. That the omiſſion of any Points unmentioned is not to be attributed to a miſtaken Judgment concerning them, and far leſs when the things expreſſed are granted to be Truths or Errors upon a reaſon that alike infers what is omitted. 2. That the Approvers do truly intend for ſubſtance what is declared. 3. That in a Body of Subſcribers ſome few may be more narrow in their Conceptions, and therefore to avoid a Breach, muſt be accommodated in the phraſing of ſome Points beyond what the others, if at full liberty, would either need or chuſe. 4. If any thing be a little darkly or ſuſpiciouſly worded in one part, and more expreſly and fully in another, the latter muſt be the Index of their Judgment; upon which account we cite not only their *State of Error and Truth*, but refer

refer to the Pages containing their Explications, and approved *Authorities*, ſome of which will be mentioned afterwards. 5. That they ought not to be charged with the Conſequences of any occaſional Paſſages which they diſown.

2. Theſe juſt Rules being admitted, we ſhall enumerate the *hurtful Antinomian Errors*, as Antinomianiſm is deſcribed in the laſt Age (which in many things differs from what was ſo called at firſt) and under each refer you to the places (beſides the abovementioned *State of Error and Truth*) wherein the Brethren have ſo laudably vindicated themſelves by their *Declaration*.

The dangerous Parts of *Antinomianiſm* are reducible to theſe general Heads. 1. As it renders the *Miniſtry* unapt to its proper Ends. 2. As it tends to *Libertiniſm* in Practice. 3. As it hinders a well-grounded *Aſſurance*, and encourageth *Preſumption*. 4. As it reproacheth *Chriſt* our bleſſed Redeemer. Againſt each of which our Brethren bear their Teſtimony.

1. The hurtful *Antinomian* Errors which render the *Miniſtry* unapt to its proper Ends, are, 1. Unduly limiting the *Offers* of Salvation, and decrying Arguments to excite Sinners to uſe their Endeavours under the Aſſiſtance of Goſpel Means and common Grace. Againſt this ſee *Error* 10. and from *p.* 41 to 47. 2. Forbidding and branding as *legal* the *preaching* of Duties and Threatnings, and the applying of promiſed Benefits as Motives to Faith and other Duties, whereto thoſe

Benefits are promiſed. Againſt which ſee *Error* 9. and *p.* 36, 39. *Error* 6. and *p.* 25, 26, 45. 3. Denying that the Elect whilſt *unconverted*, are under the Curſe of the Law, and affirming they are united to Chriſt, and juſtified *before God*, and pardoned whilſt impenitent Infidels. Againſt which ſee *Errors* 1, 2, 11. and *p.* 12 to 18. and 47, 58.

2. The hurtful *Antinomian* Errors tending to *Libertiniſm* in Practice, beſides the Impediments to a Sinner's Conviction and Converſion under the fore-mentioned Head of the *Miniſtry*, are ſuch as theſe: 1. That *God ſeeth no Sin in his People*, accounts them not their Sins but Chriſt's, and is not *diſpleaſed* with his People, nor afflicts them *for* their Sins. Againſt which ſee *Error* 3. and *p.* 19. 2. That *Repentance* is not neceſſary to Forgiveneſs, nor are Believers to mourn for Sin, or to beg Pardon, nor to confeſs it, unleſs it be to ſhew, for Chriſt's Glory, how many the Sins are which are become his. Againſt which ſee *Error* 4. and *p.* 19, 20, 21, 47, 58. 3. That their Sins can do Believers no *hurt*. Againſt this ſee *Error* 5. *p.* 22, 23. 4. That we ought not to *intend* our own Benefits by our Duties, neither are bound to perform Duties unleſs *excited* thereto by the Spirit, nor are any Acts of our Obedience *rewardable*; and that continued Repentance and Holineſs are not by the *Conſtitution of the Goſpel* neceſſary to our being poſſeſſed of Eternal Life. Againſt this ſee *Errors* 6, 10, 11. and *p.* 25, 26, 27, 47, 58, 59. 5. That juſtifying Faith is a Perſwaſion that Chriſt is mine, and that my Sins

Sins are pardoned in Chriſt. Againſt this ſee *Error* 8. and *p.* 30, 31.

3. The hurtful *Antinomian* Error which hinders a well-grounded Aſſurance and Peace, and alſo encourages Preſumption, is, that beſides the laſt deſcription of Faith, we are not to try our State by marks and ſigns of Sanctification. Againſt this ſee *Error* 8. and *p.* 32, 33, 34.

4. The hurtful *Antinomian* Errors reproachful to Chriſt our Redeemer are ſuch as theſe, that Chriſt is as ſinful as we, and we are as righteous as Chriſt. Againſt which ſee *Error* 11. *p.* 48, 57.

If the Reader conſult theſe places, and compare them with our *State of Truth and Error* in the firſt Chapter, he cannot but rejoice in our Brethrens Agreement with us in a Teſtimony againſt *Antinomianiſm.*

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

SOCINIAN Errors concerning Christ's Satisfaction. *Also* LIMBORG's, *with some other ARMINIANS concerning Christ's* Satisfaction. *SOCINIAN Errors as to* Justification. LIMBORG's, *with some other* Arminian *Errors about* Justification. *With a state of* Truths *opposite to each of these, as also to* Popish *Errors.*

FInding our Brethren suggest in the Preface to this Declaration, that after all we have said in *Cap.* 1 and 2. yet still we ought to do more to *discharge* our selves from *hurtful* Errors about Christ's *Satisfaction* and our *Justification*; we shall to promote Peace renounce several more *Errors* about those two Doctrines wherein we are suspected, and tell them what we think to be Truths.

Error 1. Punitive Justice against Sin is no Property of God, but only an Effect of his Will, and therefore there was no need of any Satisfaction to be made by Christ for Sin; nor is it less than ridiculous to say God was at once just as well as merciful in bringing about our Salvation by Christ: *Socin. opera Theol. Tom.* 1. *Prælect. cap.* 16. & *Tom.* 2. *de Servator. par.* 1. *cap.* 1. *Præl. cap.* 16. *Wolzog. in Mat.* 19. 28. *Crel. Resp. ad Grot. cap.* 1.

Truth.

Truth. God is eſſentially juſt, and ſo zealous for the Honour of his Law when enacted and his Government, that Sin muſt not go unpuniſhed; and therefore if Sinners be ſaved from the Puniſhments threatned by the violated Law for Chriſt their Mediator's ſake, it was neceſſary that he made Satisfaction to Punitive Juſtice by enduring the Penal Effects of God's Wrath.

Error 2. Jeſus Chriſt is not the true eternal moſt High God, of the ſame Subſtance, Authority and Power with the Father. *Socin. Tom.* 2. *Reſponſ. ad Jac. Vujeki, cap.* 1, &c.

Truth. Jeſus Chriſt is the true eternal moſt High God, of the ſame Subſtance, Authority and Power with the Father, and in time aſſumed the Human Nature, and remaineth God-Man for ever more.

Note, This Article is inſerted, becauſe the *Value* of Chriſt's Obedience and Death, for *Satisfaction* and *Merit*, was derived from the Dignity of Chriſt's Perſon as God: And therefore tho the *Socinians* faintly argue, that if Chriſt were the eternal God, it would not render his Death a Satisfaction; yet it's evident their great Concern in denying Chriſt's Satisfaction is to prevent the unanſwerable Argument this would be for his Deity. The like is alſo to be ſeen by their Notion of the *Lord's-Supper.*

Error 3. Chriſt did not by his Blood acquire or purchaſe the Goſpel-Covenant, nor was his Death an impulſive Cauſe of God's promiſing to Men the Bleſſings of that Covenant; nor did it

move

move him to make ſuch Promiſes: But Chriſt was only the Mediator, that is, Sponſor of it, who aſſured Men that God would accompliſh it, and who in God's Name, and by his Command, performed ſuch things as belonged to the confirming and executing of the ſaid Covenant. *Socin. Tom.* 2. 168, 199. *Crell. Vol.* 1. *p.* 612. and *Vol.* 3. *Reſp. ad Grot. p.* 19, 128, 171. & *Vol.* 1. 612.

Truth. Chriſt did not only confirm the Goſpel-Covenant to Men, and do ſuch things as belonged to the execution of the Goſpel Promiſes, but God as Governor made thoſe Promiſes in conſideration of the Death of Chriſt, as what vindicated the Glory of his Government in offering and promiſing ſuch Bleſſings to condemned Sinners, altho as our abſolute Lord and Proprietor he freely purpoſed within himſelf, that thoſe Bleſſings ſhould be granted in what method he judged fit.

Error 4. Chriſt was for no other cauſe a Mediator, nor ſo call'd, but that he was appointed by God a middle Perſon between himſelf and Men, not that he ſhould appeaſe God towards Men, but that he ſhould declare God already pacified to them, and moſt evidently confirm the ſame by himſelf: And as for Men who were Haters of and Enemies to God, them he was to reconcile to God (*i. e.* convert) and be our eternal Lawgiver, and faithful Interpreter of the Divine Will to them, by whom they might always have acceſs to God, and obtain eternal Life. *Socin. Tom.* 1. 788.

Truth.

Truth. Jeſus Chriſt was by Divine Adjuſtment a middle Perſon between God and Sinners, and as ſuch laid his hand on both; undertaking to appeaſe God's Wrath, and procure Salvation for us at his hand; and alſo to make God and the way of Salvation known to us for our Reconciliation and Obedience to God: and by him God ſtill imparts his Bleſſings to us, and admits us free acceſs to himſelf.

Error 5. Chriſt is called a Surety as a Sponſor or Meſſenger on God's part to us, but he promiſed nothing to God for us. *Crell. vol.* 1. *p.* 612.

Truth. Tho Chriſt was not a joint federating Party with us in the Covenant of Works, yet he was not only a Surety on God's part to us, but he was a mediating Surety on both parts; and as ſuch he engaged in the Covenant of Redemption to make Atonement for us, and in the Goſpel-Covenant, that all true Believers ſhall perſevere to the obtaining of eternal Life.

Error 6. Chriſt was not an High-Prieſt while on Earth, nor was his Blood offered by him to God, but it was himſelf was offered, and that not on the Croſs, but when he entred into Heaven; yet the Death of Chriſt ſo far belongs to his Prieſthood, that he was prepared by his Death to become a High-Prieſt, and to offer himſelf a perfect Sacrifice for Sin in Heaven, neither of which could be according to the Decree of God, if his Death had not intervened. *Crell. vol.* 2. *Reſp. ad Grot. cap.* 10. *vol.* 1. 613. *vol.* 2. *par.*

par. 1. 162. *Socin. Tom.* 1. *Prælect. Theol. cap.* 23.

Truth. Chriſt was an High-Prieſt while he was on Earth, and as ſuch upon the Croſs offered up himſelf by his bloody Death a perfect Sacrifice, whereby his Blood was a propitiatory offering at the very time it was ſhed; and tho in the virtue thereof the Saints were ſaved before his Incarnation, and Chriſt for ever intercedeth in the Heavens, yet the preſenting of himſelf or it there, makes no addition to the Perfection of it as a Sacrifice.

Error 7. There is no uſe nor place in the Prieſthood of Chriſt for appeaſing God's Wrath, or offering any Sacrifice, no not in Heaven, as a Condition of obtaining Remiſſion properly as from God, or impetrating the ſame; but Chriſt's Death is a means of our enjoying that Remiſſion from God, and it was indirectly a Condition thereof as to be given to us, *i. e.* it was a Condition impoſed on Chriſt, without which, by the Divine Decree, he was not to obtain Authority from God to forgive us our Sins; and it may be called a Sacrifice to God's Mercy, as of his own free Grace reconciled, but not as offended with Sinners. *Socin. Tom.* 2. 665, 666. *Crell. vol.* 1. 612. *Wolzog. in Joh.* 3. 16.

Truth. The firſt and principal uſe of Chriſt's Prieſthood, was to offer on the Croſs a Sacrifice to appeaſe God's Wrath againſt Sinners, and to impetrate Remiſſion and eternal Life, that ſo God the offended Governor might, conſiſtently with the Honour of his Law, and of all his Divine Perfections, be at liberty, and inclined

inclined as well to give the ſaid Bleſſings, as that we might become actual Partakers of them from Chriſt, as authorized to apply them to us: And all the other Sacerdotal Acts of Chriſt do refer to this.

Error 8. Redemption mentioned in the New Teſtament, ſignifies no more nor other than a freeing us from the Puniſhment of Sin without any proper Price intervening. And when it's ſaid, Redemption is obtained by the Blood of Chriſt, it's not meant that the Blood of Chriſt could move God, or that God was thereby obliged to grant us Deliverance from the Puniſhment of our Sins, but that the ſhedding of his Blood ought to intervene, that we might be moved thereby to accept that Deliverance when offered to us. Neither did Chriſt buy us, but God by Chriſt aſſerted his Right to us; and tho our Deliverance from Puniſhment is gotten as if by a Price, yet this is not as if the Blood of Chriſt were paid to any. *Socin. Tom.* . *Præl. Theol. cap.* 19. *Tom.* 2. 145, 147. *Slicht. in Rom. cap.* 5. *v.* 10.

Truth. Redemption by the Blood of Chriſt, is that we are bought by his Blood as a proper Price, and delivered from the Curſe of the Law, and Captivity under Sin and Satan, as by a proper Ranſom paid to the juſt Governor of the World.

Error 9. Chriſt by his Death did not reconcile God to us, but he reconcileth us to God by his Death, *i. e.* we come thereby to be converted to God, and ceaſe to offend him; yea, God's Anger was ſo far from being ap-

appeaſed by the Death of Chriſt, that thereby it was declared, that God was before pacified to us. *Socin. Tom.* 1. 144, 145, 665, 666. *Crell. vol.* 3. *Reſp. ad Grot.* 154, 155, 107. *Slicht. Tom.* 2. 214, 401. *& in Rom.* 5. 10. *& 2 Cor.* 5.

Truth. We being Children of Wrath becauſe of our Sin, the Lord Jeſus did by his Death atone our offended God, who became thereby ſo reconciled, that he offereth Peace to Sinners, and requireth and urgeth us by believing aright to accept thereof; and upon our penitent believing he becomes actually reconciled to us, delighting in us, and dealing with us as Objects of his reſtored Favour.

Note 1. *Crellius Reſp. ad Grot. cap.* 8. *part.* 3. diſputes againſt this as the Error of *Grotius* and the reſt of the Orthodox, ſtating it in theſe words, "God was before angry, but "being appeaſed by the Death of Chriſt he "determined to lay aſide his Anger, and "upon our believing and repenting he doth "*actually* lay aſide his Anger.

2. *Grotius de Satisf. cap.* 7. diſtinguiſheth the Actings of the Divine Will; 1. As *before* Chriſt's Death is decreed, *&c.* then God is angry with the Sinner, yet ſo as not to be averſe to all methods of Reconciliation. 2. *Upon* Chriſt's Death (as well when fixed as when undergone) then God not only appoints the way, but *promiſeth* to be reconciled. 3. When a Man *believes* in Chriſt with a right Faith, and Chriſt according to the Tenor of the Covenant preſents the Believer

liever to God; then God lays aſide his Anger, and receives the Perſon into Favour (or is *actually* reconciled.)

3. How little do well-meaning *Antinomians* conſider, that not only in the third Error, *&c.* but in this *laſt Error*, they agree with the *Socinians*, and that in a Point whence *moſt* of their falſe Notions about Chriſt's Satisfaction proceed. For, ſee you not? they hold that after God's abſolute Decree to juſtify us, there's no Wrath in God to appeaſe, the change is only on *our* part: And no Reconciliation but on our ſide, whom God begs to be reconciled to him, he being already at Peace with us.

Error 10. By Chriſt's dying for our Sins as being laid on him, is not meant, that Chriſt according to his Sponſion ſatisfied *Divine Juſtice* for our Sins, or that he paid to God any thing which we owed for our Sins; but when he is ſaid to have died for our Sins as they were laid on him, nothing elſe is meant, but that he died by *occaſion* of our Sins, *to take them away*, i. e. he died to *reclaim* us from our Sins, and to *aſſure* us, that if we did leave our Sins we ſhould be forgiven; and beſides this, that we might *perceive* and obtain the fruit of that Forgiveneſs, *&c. Socin. Tom.* 2. 153. *Tom.* 1. *Præl. Theol. cap.* 18, 20. *Crell. Vol.* 3. *Reſp. ad Grot. cap.* 9.

Truth. When it's ſaid, *Chriſt died for our Sins* as being laid on him, it's not only to bring about the forementioned Ends, and ſuch other Purpoſes as are aſſigned by the *Socinians*,

nians, but they were imputed to him as what he had for our Salvation engaged to make Satisfaction for: And he did by his Death make a real, full and proper Satisfaction to God's Juſtice, vindicating the Honour of his Juſtice and Government, and of the violated Law as fully, as if the pardoned Sinner had endured the utmoſt Puniſhment threatned by the ſaid Law.

Error 11. God did not inflict Death on Chriſt our Mediator to expreſs his hatred of Sin, and deter us from it by his Death as any inſtance of Divine Diſpleaſure againſt our Offences, and therefore our Sins were not puniſhed in Chriſt. *Socin. Tom.* 1. 577, 578, 581. *Tom.* 2. 194. *Crell. vol.* 1. *de Morte Chriſti p.* 611.

Truth. God did puniſh our Sins in the Death of Chriſt, by ſhewing his real Hatred againſt Sin in all the Extremities Chriſt did endure; which Extremities and Death thus inflicted were not only fit, but truly deſign'd to deter us from all Diſobedience, againſt which God thus teſtified his high Diſpleaſure.

Error 12. Chriſt did not by his Death properly merit Salvation or any other thing for us, nor did he by the Merit of his great Obedience appeaſe God's Anger. *Socin. Tom.* 2. *de Servat. Part.* 3. *cap.* 6. *p.* 205. *Ruari Epiſt.* 164. *Smal. Diſp.* 2. *contr. Frantz.*

Truth. Chriſt by his Death and Obedience did properly merit our Salvation, and the Reconciliation of God to us; his Death being to be conſidered firſt as ſatisfactory, and then meritorious; and his Obedience firſt

as

as meritorious, and then ſatisfactory.

Error 13. By Chriſt's dying *for* us, or in our *ſtead* (as ſome of them ſometimes word it, tho they expreſly diſpute againſt it) is not meant, that Chriſt was ſubſtituted to die in the room of us who were condemned to die, that God might be pacified, nor that his Death was inſtead of our Death, that we for the Merit of it might be delivered; but the meaning is, that Chriſt for our good did by his Death come to be crowned with Glory and Power, whereby he is able to make us meet for Pardon, and authorized to give that Pardon to us. *Socin. Prælect. cap.* 20, 21. *& de Servat. cap.* 8. *Crell. Reſp. ad Grot. cap.* 9. *Par.* 1, *&c.*

Truth. By Chriſt's dying for us, and in our ſtead, is meant, that whereas we Sinners were condemned to die for our Sins, our Lord Jeſus, tho he became not a Sinner in our ſtead, yet as Mediator, he was ſubſtituted to die in our ſtead, that by his Death God might be *inclined* to forgive us who otherwiſe muſt have died (and by virtue of his Death, as a Satisfaction to Divine Juſtice, we are delivered from Death.) This Parentheſis I add to the Deſcription *Grotius* gives of Chriſt's dying in our ſtead. *De Satisf. cap.* 9.

LIMBORG's *Opinion of Chriſt's* Satisfaction conſonant to *EPISCOPIUS* and ſome few other *Arminians.*

Error 14. Vindictive Juſtice required not Satiſ-

Satisfaction to be made in order to the remiſſion of Sin. *Limbor. Theol. Chriſtian. lib.* 3. *cap.* 18. §. 4.

Truth. Vindictive Juſtice for the Honour of the Divine Law required Satisfaction in order to the remiſſion of Sin, at leaſt after the enacting of *Adam*'s Covenant.

Error 15. Chriſt's Sufferings were not a full Satisfaction to Juſtice, nor was the Price of our Redemption *fully* equivalent to the Miſery we deſerved: But God might accept as a redeeming Price *much or little* as himſelf judged fit, and might be ſatisfied with *any* ſort of Affliction laid on Chriſt. Nor did Chriſt ſatisfy the Rigor of Divine Juſtice, but the Will of God conſidered at once merciful as well as juſt (i. e. *Mercy abated to Chriſt in the terms of Satisfaction, what Juſtice demanded*) Lib. 3. cap. 2. §. 8, 9. cap. 22. §. 2. cap. 23. §. 6.

Truth. Tho the great Mercy of God appeared in his being willing to admit, accept and provide Chriſt our Mediator to make Satisfaction for our Sins, yet God our juſt Governor would have it that the terms of Satisfaction propoſed to our Mediator ſhould be ſuch as *ſtrict Juſtice* demanded for the Honour of his violated Law, and ſecuring the Ends of his Government; which terms were no lower than that he ſhould ſuffer what was *fully* equivalent to the Puniſhments they whom he was to redeem deſerved to endure. And as our Lord Jeſus did ſuffer in kind much of what we deſerved to ſuffer; ſo he ſuffered (conſidering the Dignity and Innocency

cency of his Perſon) what was in the intrinſick Value *fully equivalent* to ſuch of our deſerved Puniſhments, as he was not capable of ſuffering in *kind*. Nay the Price of our Redemption paid by him, was not only equivalent to what the Law of Works required of us, but it was *ſupralegal*, that is, it far exceeded what any Sinners were thereby obliged to; nor ſee we how a full Satisfaction for all our Sins could be otherwiſe made.

Error 16. Our Faith and Regeneration were not merited by Chriſt. *Lib.* 3. *cap.* 22. §. 3.

Truth. Conſidering that our New-birth and Faith are the Fruits of the holy Spirit, whom by Sin we had expelled, his return to regenerate and make us Believers muſt be for the ſake and with reſpect to the Merits of Chriſt, as what vindicated the Honour of God who reſtored him to us.

Truth. No Penance, Pilgrimage, Faſtings or good Works of our own, or other Men, can make proper Satisfaction to Divine Juſtice for the leaſt of our Sins as to any part of their Fault or Guilt.

This laſt we add in oppoſition to what POPISH Opinions ſeem to militate againſt the Doctrine of Chriſt's Satisfaction.

Socinian Notions of Juſtification.

Error 1. In our Juſtification by Chriſt our Sins are blotted out, not by Chriſt's Death and Obedience as any Compenſation or Satisfaction

faction to God for them, but only by God's ſimple Forgiveneſs and Pardon abſolutely *free* in all reſpects, without any Merit of Chriſt's or our own. *Socin. Tom.* 1. *Prælect. Theol. cap.* 15, 16. *Crell. vol.* 1. *in Phil.* 3. 9. *& in Rom.* 3. 24.

Truth. In Juſtification upon our penitent believing our Sins are pardoned, and our Perſons accepted for the ſake of Chriſt's Death and Obedience, as what compenſated and made Satisfaction for our Sins: And tho neither our Graces nor Works do merit our Pardon, Acceptance or eternal Life, yet theſe with all other ſaving Benefits were merited by Chriſt.

Note, The *Socinians* are as much for abſolutely unlimited *free Grace* as even our *Antinomians* would pretend to be, if not more.

Error 2. Faith in Chriſt is accepted under the Goſpel as a perfect Righteouſneſs for a perfect ſinleſs Obedience: And as this Faith expreſſeth it ſelf in our Works, our Juſtification is in it ſelf firmer and ſurer. *Crell. vol.* 1. *p.* 110, 612, 613. 474.

Truth 1. Tho true Faith be a Goſpel Righteouſneſs, yet it is not accepted for ſinleſs Obedience; nor doth the Goſpel entitle us to Salvation upon our believing, as the Law did upon a perfect ſinleſs Obedience: for the Law entitled us to Life as *of Debt* for our Obedience, as the immediate Merit of that Reward by the adjuſtment of governing *Juſtice*. Whereas the Goſpel of meer Grace (tho in a way of Government) entitles the Believer to Life, as what was *merited* by the

the Lord Jesus, and not by our Faith or Works.

Truth. 2. Tho a dead Faith cannot justify us, and our believing Consent must be executed if we survive it; yet are we as truly and firmly justified, and in Christ's Right entitled to Glory when we first believe, as when those genuine Fruits of it are produced, which are contrary to that Barrenness, Ungodliness and Apostacy that would subject us to Condemnation.

We shall provide against *Limborg*'s and some other *Arminians Notion* of Justification (*tho it be none of the five Points which constitute* Arminianism) and that we in the former Papers opposed each of the said Points in concurrence with our British Divines in the Synod of *Dort*.

Error 3. By Faith being imputed for Righteousness, is meant, that God graciously for Christ's sake will account our Obedience which we yield him by Faith as if it were perfect, tho it be imperfect. As if a Creditor having a Debtor who ows him 1000 *Gilders*, should upon this Debtor's paying him 100, forgive him the rest, and graciously impute to him this *part* of Payment for the Payment of the *whole*. Lib. 6. cap. 4. §. 39.—17.

Truth. Tho we are justified by Christ believed on, and Faith in him be accounted a Gospel-Righteousness, as it is the performed Condition upon which we are by the Gospel-Promise adjudged to have the Righteousness of Christ imputed to us as our pleadable Security against the Curse of the Law; by

which Righteouſneſs of Chriſt alone our Right to Pardon and eternal Life (wherein we are perſonally inveſted by the Goſpel) is merited as well as the Bleſſings themſelves. Nevertheleſs our Faith in Chriſt is no part of the *Debt* we owed to God by the Law of Innocency, nor is it, or our ſincere Obedience proceeding from it, either in themſelves, or Divine Acceptance, a full Conformity to the Goſpel *Precepts*, much leſs doth God impute to us this Faith, or that Obedience for the payment of the whole Debt owing by the Law or Goſpel, tho he grant us thereupon that Pardon, Favour and Acceptance Chriſt hath procured, ſo as to deal with us as righteous Perſons; and theſe he doth not ſuſpend until Faith produceth the ſaid Fruit of Obedience, but grants them upon our firſt true purpoſe to turn from Sin to God, and our acceptation of and truſt in Chriſt for doing this, and for obtaining all Salvation by him.

The common POPISH Notion of Juſtification as ſtated by *Andradius* in his authorized Explication of the Decree of the *6th Seſſion of the Council of* Trent, whereto *Bellarmine*, and the generality of the Papiſts agree.

Error 4. The *firſt* Juſtification is the Renovation of an ungodly Man by the infuſed habit of Love, the infuſion of which is merited by Chriſt. The *ſecond* Juſtification is this habit of Love producing goods Works, by the Merit whereof we are further juſtified, and *ex condigno* deſerve eternal Life; but

but neither the *first* nor *second* Justification consists in the *forgiveness of Sin.*

Note. By *preparatory* Work, the Council intend with the School-men, that our Wills moved by the Spirit do by their natural Power prepare themselves to obtain the habit of Grace, and *ex congruo*, merit the Infusion of it, which Habit is that justifying Righteousness, for the Merit whereof the Sinner is at first absolved from Guilt, and accepted to eternal Life.

Truth 1. Neither this *first* nor *second* Justification is the Justification described usually in the Gospel, which is not the Conversion of a Sinner, or the progressive Holiness of a Convert, but a *forensick* Act, *viz.* God's judicial absolving us from the Curse due for Sin, and adjudging us entitled to Glory for the Merits of Christ, according to the Gospel.

Truth 2. It is not true, that preparatory Works do any way deserve from God the Habit of Grace at first infused, tho ordinarily the Divine Spirit doth by Knowledg and humbling Convictions abate the Obstacles to Grace in our Hearts, and put us upon seeking help from Christ; all which are as truly owing to his more common Operations, as saving Grace is to his special.

Truth 3. Neither the first infused Habit of Grace, nor its Acts, do merit further Grace or Holiness; nor yet any degree of that Pardon or Acceptance which by Divine Ordination ensue thereupon.

Error. 5. Christ hath merited that the Habit of Love should by its virtue extinguish

Sin in us by good Works, and we by these Works merit Reconciliation with God, Forgiveness of Sin, and eternal Glory, as what do appease his Anger, satisfy for our Guilt, and are part of the Price of eternal Glory.

Note. The Popish Error concerning Satisfaction leads them to this Error about Justification; and when Justification is considered in a *Protestant* sense, *viz.* as a *forensick* Act, the true Controversy between the Papists and us is about the Doctrine of the *Merit of good Works.*

Truth. Neither Repentance, Faith, Love, nor any good Work proceeding therefrom, do in the least *merit* Reconciliation, Pardon, or eternal Life; neither did Christ merit that *we* might merit: But Reconciliation, Pardon, and eternal Life were merited *only* by Christ's atoning, satisfying, and meriting Sufferings and Obedience: And therefore the Righteousness of Christ is accepted and reputed the only *meriting* Righteousness in God's justifying Act, altho this Act terminates on none (Adult) besides the penitent Believer, and on all such by the *Ordination* of the Gospel.

Note 1. It's one thing for *Christ* to merit, that *we* might by our Works merit Salvation, it's another thing for Christ to merit that Salvation *it self*, which he gives and applies to Men on Gospel-terms; the first is *Popish*, the last is *Protestant* Doctrine.

2. It's one thing what our Judg in his justifying Act accounts to be the thing which *appeaseth* his Anger (for Reconciliation) makes *Compensation* to Justice (for Pardon) and

and to be the meriting *Price* (of eternal Life) to which Reconciliation, Pardon, and eternal Life he now adjudgeth the penitent Believer to be entitled. Now the thing which our Judg accounts to be that which appeaseth his Anger, *&c.* is the Righteousness of Christ, and *only* that.

It's another matter *whom* our Judg in his justifying Act accounts and adjudgeth in conformity to the *Gospel-Offer*, to be the *Persons* who he therein promised should be actually reconciled, pardoned, and entitled to Glory in the alone meriting virtue of what appeased his Anger, made amends for Sin, and was the Price of Glory. Now *this Person* is the penitent Believer, and he is accounted to be such from his having Gospel-Faith in Christ, with true Repentance, and as such is adjudged to be under the Favour of the foresaid Gospel *Promise* of Reconciliation, Pardon and Glory, yet procured and merited not by his Faith, but by Christ's alone Righteousness, as before accounted for, and obtained in *his* Right, who as well had these promised to him for Believers in the Covenant of *Redemption*, as they are promised by God in Christ in the Gospel to Believers themselves for a personal Title to possess them, and to plead the Merits of Christ for the enjoyment of them.

Having testified our *Concord* with our Brethren, and and added this *further* account of what we esteem *Truth* and *Error* in the Doctrines of Satisfaction and Justification, we must express our Thankfulness to God, that our Brethren in the foresaid *Declaration*

have teſtified againſt ignorant and ſcandalous Perſons intruding themſelves into the Miniſtry. And tho the Vindication of our ſelves in this matter be needleſs, when our Principles and Practice are ſo well known; and it's ſo notorious, that of the great number of unqualified Men who are of late turned Preachers, thoſe very few who *broke out of any of our Congregations* in this City, receiv'd no Approbation or Countenance from us; and to avoid Reſtraint and Diſcouragement they renounced the Name of *Presbyterians*, yea, preach'd againſt us; yet to ſupport what we can this preſent Teſtimony of our Congregational Brethren, we'll publiſh one of the Articles agreed to by all of us for ſtrengthening our *Union* after our ſaid Brethrens Receſs, which is as follows,

" 6. That no Miniſters of the Union ſhall " admit, or conſent that any Perſon ſhall " preach in their Congregations, unleſs they " have been ſolemnly admitted to the Mini- " ſtry by *Ordination*, or approved by ſome " of the United Brethren, or produce a Te- " ſtimony that they have been under proper " and preparatory Studies to qualify them " for that ſacred Function.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Some further Examination what is Socinianiſm, as to the Doctrine of Chriſt's Satisfaction, and what is not ſo; with a brief account of ſeveral Phraſes uſed by Socinians and by the Orthodox in a very contrary ſenſe.

A Strict Obſervation in how uncertain a ſenſe Terms and Phraſes are made uſe of, muſt convince one that Errors may be eaſily concealed from the Ignorant, and the Orthodox as eaſily impeached without ground by ſagacious Perſons who deſign impoſing on the Vulgar. I ſhall give an inſtance in the Controverſy before me, which makes it evident, that Mens Explications and main Hypotheſis muſt be regarded above words, otherwiſe their ſenſe will be miſtaken.

1. I find the Socinians admit and make uſe of the words which ſome Orthodox Divines eſteemed moſt diſtinguiſhingly expreſſive of their own ſenſe, as Commutation of Perſons as well as things for Perſons, (*a*) Subſtitution and Surrogation of Chriſt's Perſon in our room. (*b*) Dying in our ſtead. (*c*) Chriſt was an Expiatory Sacrifice. (*d*) His

(*a*) Crell. vol. 2. *in* 2 Cor. 5. 14. Reſp. ad Grot. cap. 9. par. 2. (*b*) Crell. vol. 3. Reſp. ad Grot. cap. 9, 10. (*c*) Crell. Reſp. ad Grot. cap. 9. (*d*) Crell. Reſp. ad Grot. cap. 10. Socin. de Servat. lib. 2. c. 13.

Sufferings were Puniſhments. (*e*) Our Sins were an impulſive Cauſe of Chriſt's Death. (*f*) God was moved by Chriſt's Death to give us Forgiveneſs. (*g*); Yea it was a Satisfaction. (*h*) Chriſt was made a Sinner, yea the chief Sinner. And many more ſuch I could mention: But this evidenceth that theſe very Phraſes are capable of a very ill ſenſe as well as a good one. *Ruarus* admits Chriſt did in a ſenſe impetrate our Pardon by his Death. *Epiſt.* 64. So doth *Crellius Reſp. ad Got. cap.* 9. *part.* 3.

2. The laſt Chapter gave us ſuch a Summary of their Aſſertions as demonſtrates they uſe theſe Expreſſions in no good ſenſe, but if you conſult the places laſt cited, and in *Chap.* 5. you'll find them wreſted to conſiſt with the fore-mentioned Errors; but becauſe it will be tedious to particularize, I ſhall enumerate the Cauſes and Ends they plainly and truly aſcribe the Death of Chriſt to. (*a*) 1. They aſſign Chriſt's Death to God's meer Dominion over him as his entire Creature, whom he would reward for it, tho not as merited. (*b*) 2. It was an Example of Patience. (*c*) 3. It was a Preparation of his

---

(*e*) Tom. 1. Præl. cap. 21, p. 580. (*f*) Crell. Reſp. ad Grot. cap. 1. par. 11. (*g*) Crell. Reſp. ad Grot. cap. 7, 8. (*h*) Crell. vol. 2. in 2. Cor. 5. 14. Slicht. Tom. 2. in 2 Cor. 5. 21.

(*a*) Slicht. in Rom. 3. 24. & Phil. 2. 9. Crell. Reſp. ad Grot. cap. 2. par. 1. & cap. 4. par. 7. (*b*) Idem ubi ſup. ad cap. 5. (*c*) Crell. Reſp. ad Grot. 215: 198, 199.

Sacri-

Sacrifice to be offered to God in Heaven for our Sins. (*d*) 4. It shew'd how much he desired our Salvation, tho such great Sinners, and how faithful he would be in expiating our Sins in Heaven, when he endured such dreadful things for our sakes, which God would have chiefly considered in our High-Priest. (*e*) 5. His Death impressed a tender Affection and Pity towards us, that so he would succour us who were to be so extreamly afflicted, God would not have put Mankind in his hands unless he first suffered Death for Sinners: And that God might render us more assured, that if we obeyed we should have eternal Life; Christ should be so fashioned that in a sense it should appear Christ had more Tenderness for us than God himself, or otherwise it had been as to us alike, that God had saved us immediately, as to have saved us by Christ. Or, (*f*) 6. To establish the new Covenant and Promises. (*g*) 7. To confirm his Doctrine. (*h*) 8. To come pursuant to God's Decree to be crowned with Glory and Honour, and invested with Authority and Power to convert, protect, forgive, and give us eternal Life. (*i*) 9. That there might be greater Rewards promised to induce us to repent than there were be-

(*d*) Ubi supra cap. 7. & cap. 1. (*e*) Crell. vol. 1. 612, 613. (*f*) Socin. Tom. 1. 596. Crell. vol. 620, 621. (*g*) Crell. vol. 1. 612, 614, 616. (*h*) Socin. Tom. 1. 578, 579. cap. 21. p. 580, 599. (*i*) Crell. Tom. 1. 619. Wolz. vol. 1. Prælect. cap. 2.

fore. (*k*) 10. To take away those greater Sins which the legal Sacrifices were not appointed for. (*l*) 11. Beget in us a firm hope of Life, tho we should die as terrible a Death. (*m*) 12. That we might not fear Death, or the Curse, which we see conquered by him. (*n*) 13. That we might be induced to leave our Sin, when he died that we might be reclaimed from it by such hope of Pardon upon leaving of it. (*o*) 14. To make known how highly kind and pacified God was to us. I pass by a compliance with Pagan Customs.

3. As they *limit* Christ's Death in this manner, exclusively of and in opposition to other Causes and Ends, which the proper Satisfaction of Christ more directly supposeth, as you see in the fifth *Chapter*. So I could easily shew how they dilute their own seeming Concessions, as well as reduce plain Scripture-Expressions to that Insignificancy, that no Man can hope by their method to apprehend any kind of words with certainty as to their meaning; one while an *as if* (a *quasi*) is all they intend by their large Grants, *as if* a redeeming Price, *&c.* God is *as it were* moved, and *as it were* obliged by Christ to pardon us: another while all is figurative, as a *metaphorical* Redemption. Christ's Death

(*k*) Socin. 1. Tom. 590, 594. Slicht. Tom. 2. 37. Crell. vol. 2. in Heb. 9. 13, 14, 15. (*l*) Socin. Tom. 1. p. 667. Crell. Tom. 1. 618. (*m*) Socin. Tom. 1. 575, 596. (*n*) Socin. Tom. 1. 577, 588. (*o*) Socin. Tom. 1. 586. Crell. vol. 2. par. 2. p. 285.

was

was an Expiatory Sacrifice, *i. e. metonymically* and *ſynechdocically* called ſo, and it chiefly ſignifies what by God's Decree followed upon it, *viz.* his Entrance into Heaven. Many more might be heaped of this kind. *Socin. de Servat. par.* 2. *cap.* 2. *Crell. vol.* 1. *in Rom.* 3. 24. *vol.* 3. *Reſp. ad Grot. cap.* 8. *par.* 3. *p.* 198, 189. *Socin. Tom.* 1. *Prælect. cap.* 20.

4. They ſometimes ſtate the Difference between themſelves and others, and there are ſome things they ſtill adhere to and ſecure, however they perplex this Controverſy with their ſeeming Grants and equivocal Expreſſions.

(1.) *Socinus* ſtates this Queſtion and denies it: Are our Sins blotted out by any Compenſation or Satisfaction, or elſe by Forgiveneſs? Moſt think they are blotted out, a Satisfaction intervening: but we think they are blotted out by ſimple Forgiveneſs, *or a Pardon abſolutely free.* Præl. cap. 15. p. 565. He alſo ſtates the Difference with *Covet*, and puts this for the Poſition held by his own Party. I judg and think this to be the Orthodox Determination, That Jeſus Chriſt is therefore our Saviour, becauſe he hath made known to us the way of eternal Life; and in his own Perſon, both by the Example of his Life, and riſing from the dead, hath given aſſurance of it, and made it evident, as alſo that he will give eternal Life to us who believe him. But I affirm, that he neither ſatisfied Divine Juſtice, by which we Sinners did deſerve to be damned; nor was there any need that he ſhould ſatisfy it. *Socin. Tom.*

Tom. 2. *de Servat. cap.* 1. 121. *Crellius* ſtates this Queſtion; Did the Redemption wrought by Chriſt include his Payment of a *true Price* to God for our Sins, which he calls Satisfaction? *Reſp. ad Grot. cap.* 8. This he denies; and he and others of them take great advantage of *Covet*'s making uſe of *Creditor, Debtor, and Debt*, to expreſs their Judgment in this Controverſy. Other Inſtances might be given.

(2.) The principal things they adhere to are, 1. That Chriſt did not appeaſe God's Anger towards Sinners. 2. That what Chriſt did and ſuffered had no meriting Virtue; and ſo did not merit from God our Pardon, Acceptance and eternal Life, or properly move God to give or promiſe them. Theſe are the Heart of *Socinianiſm* as to the Satisfaction of Chriſt; and they do exclude what Chriſt performs *in Heaven*, as well as his Death on Earth, from any proper influence. Godward as to theſe things, tho to effect what they call Expiation, they aſcribe more to Chriſt's abiding on God's Right-hand taking care of the Church, than to his Reſurrection, and more to his Reſurrection than to his Death; theſe two laſt being but the decreed intervening way of coming to the other, which they call the Expiation it ſelf. Hence they always deny any proper redeeming Price, and ſay God quitted his right to puniſh us without any reſpect to Chriſt; and diſtinguiſh of Expiation on God's part (which they call his own Act;) and on our part, which is, ſay they, Chriſt's giving us eternal Life; wherein is con-

contain'd a full deliverance from the Puniſhment of Sin. As to Expiation on *God's part*, that's in no wiſe by Chriſt's inclining God to forgive our Sins by his Sacrifice; yea *Socinus* tells us God alone expiates Sin. And when *CRELLIUS* blames *Grotius* for making *Socinus* to confine the Efficacy of Chriſt's Sacrifice to Sins future for Prevention or Pardon, and excluding the Forgiveneſs of Sins paſt, otherwiſe than as it begets Faith, and ſo turns us from Sin. What greater expiating Virtue doth he aſcribe to it under the Notion of an expiating Sacrifice? it's this, it takes away the Guilt and Puniſhments of all Sins tho paſt before Converſion, and however great: But how and wherein? He anſwers, it's partly by declaring and granting us a right to that thing, and partly by actually taking away Divine Puniſhments. *But is that Right or Pardon at all properly procured by this Sacrifice?* No, by no means; that he had denied, and abides by the Denial here, and in the following Sections. The ſum is; a crucified Saviour his being exalted, and in Heaven taking care of our Salvation, aſſures us, that we ſhall be partakers of the Pardon appointed and promiſed before by the meer Mercy of God without reſpect to Chriſt; and Chriſt as the authorized Sponſor on God's part conveys it, and aſſiſted with the Divine Power fully removes the Puniſhments, or rather God himſelf doth it: Nay, by their Scheme you cannot well ſee them allow leſs expiating Virtue to *Mens Prayers* than the legal Sacrifices, yea the yearly: for,

ſay,

ſay they, we expiate our own Sins by thoſe Prayers; and ſcarce more to *Chriſt*'s Sacrifice than the Legal, except as to more ſorts of Sin, and its greater aptneſs to diſſwade us from Sin by the Love of God, and ſtrong grounds of hopes of higher Rewards, being more evidenced and aſſured by this Sacrifice of Chriſt, than by thoſe of the Law: For this Sacrifice of Chriſt is no other than an intervening Means, which being performed, that Diſcharge follows by the Divine Decree, which the ſelf-inclined God, unmoved by any thing Chriſt was to do or ſuffer, reſolved freely to beſtow of his meer Mercy.

To add no more, they carefully diſtinguiſh between the Impetration of Pardon, *&c.* with reſpect to the Divine Will, and the means of the application of that Pardon to the Sinner. From the former they exclude Chriſt's Satisfaction and Merits, and confine their Virtue truly altogether to the latter. The thing it ſelf is unprocured as from God, the Sinner's obtaining it is ſubſerved by Chriſt by what he perfoms to make us meet for it, and poſſeſſing us in the Effects of it according to the way decreed, and that only becauſe *decreed*. *Socin. Tom.* 1. *Prælect. cap.* 27. 21, 22, 23, 24. *Tom.* 2. *de Serv. cap.* 4. *Crell. Reſp. ad Grot. cap.* 8, 9, 10.

5. It's very obvious that the Socinian Controverſy lies not in thoſe things wherein ſome are induced to place them, becauſe of certain Phraſes ſometimes occurring in Debates concerning the Doctrine of Chriſt's Satisfaction. To Inſtance a few.

(1.) It's

(1.) It's not whether the Sufferings of a *Sponſor* in the ſtead of the Sinner be in *ſo ſtrict a ſenſe* a proper Puniſhment, as the Sufferings of the *Delinquent* himſelf would be? this is nothing with them; for their Queſtion is, Were Chriſt's Sufferings ſuch an Inſtance of God's rectoral *Hatred* againſt our Sins, and *Anger* againſt Sinners, as that thereby the Honour of his Juſtice and injured Government and Law was provided for, and vindicated, and Sinners to be deterred from Sin by God's inſiſting upon ſuch a penal *Compenſation* before he would be *reconciled* to us? Puniſhment under this Notion they expreſly diſpute againſt.

(2.) Nor is it about the Phraſe *Commutation of Perſons* between Chriſt and Sinners, they grant it; admit a *Surrogation* of the typical Sacrifice inſtead of the Sinner, and a *Subſtitution* of Chriſt in our place. Their Point depends not on any ſuch mere words. But was Chriſt appointed, and did he conſent to endure what the Sinner was to ſuffer, that in *virtue* thereof the offended God might be *appeaſed*, and the Sinner *delivered?* This is the thing they oppoſe. *Crell. Reſp. ad Grot. cap. 9. par. 14.* explaining this very Phraſe.

(3.) Nor is with them the Queſtion, Whether Chriſt's Sufferings were in part the *Idem*, and in other reſpects a full *Equivalent* to the Puniſhments the Sinner deſerved: No, their Arguments run againſt the *Equivalency*, and on that account deny that his Sufferings could be a *full Price* of Redemption, or a *Satisfaction*; and well they may, when they call

call him a *mere* Creature. *Crell. Resp. ad Grot. c. 4. par. 2. & c. 6. par. 18.* It's the *Proportion* in the Value they most directly militate against.

(4.) Nor, whether Christ was a *Sinner* in judicial Esteem, or was he reputed the *innocent* Mediator making *amends to Justice* for our Sins, that we the Offendors might be redeemed by his *merits*, who, to make Satisfaction, submitted to be dealt with as if he had been a *Sinner*. The last is enough for their Abhorrence; and tho *Socinus* took all Advantages to expose the Orthodox, in representing their Opinion as to the Imputation of Sin to Christ, yet grants they hold that Christ was truly innocent, and reputed so by God even when he was punished as if an Offender. *De Servat. cap. 6.* It's true, sometimes they would force some such Consequence on the words of the Orthodox, as if Christ must be legally reputed a Sinner, but that is to furnish themselves with an Argument to *ridicule* the true Doctrine of Satisfaction. And note, they deny that *2 Cor. 5. 21. Christ was made Sin*, to be Christ was made a Sacrifice for Sin; yea some render it, he was made a Sinner, as *Slicht.* &c. God dealt with him as a Sinner. *Socin in loc.*

(5.) It's far enough from the *Socinian* Controversy, whether Christ was *immediately* obliged by the Law of Works to die, *i. e.* Did God thus sentence him, Thou Christ hast sinned, and therefore thou shalt die? Or, was he immediately obliged to die by the Covenant of Redemption, and *mediately* by the Law of Works, *i. e.* the Sentence is to

to be thus apprehended? Whereas thou my Son the Mediator, haſt with my Conſent, declared thy willingneſs to expiate Sin, and ranſom Sinners, juſtly condemned by the Curſe of my Law to die: And whereas my *Vindictive Juſtice*, the Honour of my Law and Government, required that I the *Rector* ſhould exact Satisfaction and Reparation for the Crimes of theſe Sinners by *thy* Death, if I agreed to *thy* redeeming and ſaving them, and thou haſt *obliged* thy ſelf to die in their ſtead to redeem them, *therefore* thou ſhalt die this accurſed, ſhameful Death.

This, I ſay, is no part of the Diſpute with the *Socinians*, for the laſt account doth as directly oppoſe their Notions as the former, nay much more; for it aſſerts the Compact before his Incarnation, and conſequently the *Divinity*, at leaſt *Preexiſtence* of Chriſt.

(6.) Nor yet is it of any moment with them, whether Men ſay Sin would be in a more proper ſenſe the *immediate* meritorious Cauſe of the *Sinner's* dying who committed the Sin, than of Chriſt's dying who did not commit the Sin, tho he obliged himſelf to make *Satisfaction* for it in the Sinner's *ſtead*, that the provoked God might be reconciled to him. The Point with them being this, Did our Sins, notwithſtanding God's *merciful* Diſpoſition, retain that *Demerit* in his account, as rendered Satisfaction for it by Death *neceſſary* to reconcile him to Sinners; and conſequently did Chriſt ſuffer Death to make that *Satisfaction* which was become thus neceſſary by Sin, and yet impoſſible

poſſible for the Sinner to make.

(7.) It's true, the *Socinians* uſually ſay our Sins were the *occaſion* of Chriſt's Death (yet oft they call them the antecedent Cauſe) but occaſion being more common and agreeable to their *Hypotheſis*, I wiſh others had waved that word to prevent Abuſe. Nevertheleſs the mere uſing of that word is far from arguing any Man to *Socinianize*, ſo that he apply it to a ſenſe oppoſite to what *Socinians* do. This will appear, if we conſider in what ſenſe the *Socinians* uſe it; they ſay our Sin was an occaſion of Chriſt's Death, as Sin was that which we were to be reclaimed from, and our hope ſupported againſt. And the Death of Chriſt was that way in which God, who was not unreconciled before, did appoint Chriſt to reclaim us from our Sins; as his Death aſſureth us of the Truth of his Doctrine and Promiſes, manifeſteth God's prior Reconciliation, and ſo his Death became an Argument to encline us to believe and repent, and alſo a *cauſa ſine qua non*; both of a ſtrong Motive to Holineſs, *viz.* the endleſs Glory deſigned in Heaven for us (which was before ſhut up) and of that Power, Authority and Care of Chriſt at God's Right-hand to bring us into the Poſſeſſion of it.

But when others ſhall call our Sins an *occaſion* of Chriſt's Death, and explain it thus; That it was an occaſion of Chriſt's Death as a *penal* Satisfaction to the *Juſtice* of God, and that he endured it to *pacify* God to Sinners; that God's *hatred* of Sin, and his Juſtice

Juſtice (yea *punitive* Juſtice) might be no leſs demonſtrated in Chriſt's Satisfaction, than if the Sinners had been *damned.* And his Obedience, and his Puniſhments wherein *Vindictive Juſtice* was thus glorified, did *merit* the Pardon of our Sins, and eternal Life, ſuch an *Explication* doth as much oppoſe *Socinianiſm*, as if they had uſed the word *meritorious Cauſe* inſtead of *occaſion.*

That no Perſon may pretend the Reverend Mr. *Baxter's* Authority in favour of *Socinianiſm*, becauſe he ſometimes calls our Sins an *occaſion of Chriſt's Death*, I do aſſure the Reader that he explains the word *occaſion* in the laſt ſenſe, and in the moſt direct oppoſition to *Socinianiſm:* nor can any pretend but the reaſon he uſeth this word, as alſo *pro cauſa meritoria*, or inſtead of a meritorious Cauſe, is only to diſtinguiſh Chriſt the *Sponſor* making Satisfaction to Juſtice for our Sins, from the *Sinner* himſelf when ſuffering for his *own* Sins. To evidence which, I have repeated his own Aſſertions under this ſeventh Head, and could eaſily cite his own words, which agree exactly to what's *Antiſocinian* in the ſix foregoing Heads. See *Method. Theol. par.* 3. *cap.* 1. *determ.* 11, 12, 15.

Need I add that he ſays, "God declared "to the feeling of Chriſt his *Diſpleaſure* a- "gainſt Sin, which was the *Cauſe* of all the "Miſeries which he endured, *i. e.* ſaith he, "Chriſt bare thoſe *Puniſhments* which the "Anger and Diſpleaſure of God againſt Sin "and Sinners *cauſed* to be inflicted on him "our Sponſor. *Ubi ſup. Diſp.* 4. and all this

"in

" in *our* ſtead. *Det.* 10. He made Satiſ-
" faction for our Sins to God as *Rector*, and
" as the injured Party: *Determ.* 14. Chriſt's
" Death anſwered all the Ends of the *moſt*
" proper Puniſhments, and of the *Threat-*
" *ning* of the Law: *Determ.* 12. When he
" calls Sin an occaſion of Chriſt's Death, he
" there calls it alſo a remote meritorious
" Cauſe: *Determ.* 5. And as for a proper meri-
" torious Cauſe as when *Children* are puniſh-
" ed for their Parents Sins: *Determ.* 5. His
" Safaction yielded to our moſt juſt Rector
" a ſufficient *ground* on which to forgive peni-
" tent Believers ſpiritual and *eternal* Puniſh-
" ments: *Diſp.* 2. Nay, he ſees not, ſuppo-
" ſing the Law of Works, how God *could*
" forgive our Sins without the *Penal* Satiſ-
" faction of Chriſt: *Diſp.* 2. *&* *Determ.* 15.
It were endleſs to produce the Inſtances demonſtrating the Orthodoxneſs of this great Man as to the Satisfaction of Chriſt againſt *Socinianiſm*. And by the way, ſuch as ſay, Chriſt's penal Satisfaction was *not* neceſſary to the forgiveneſs of our Sins, do a thouſand times more favour Socinianiſm than Mr. *Baxter's* Notions or Words can be wreſted to.

Perhaps others who follow *Epiſcopius* and ſome other *Arminians* (when all muſt acquit him of *Socinianiſm*) may ſurmiſe he favoureth their Notion of Chriſt's Death, as if it were a Satisfaction only to the *Will of God*, and not a full Satisfaction to the *Juſtice of God*. To this I anſwer, Mr. *B.* diſtinguiſheth Satisfaction into that which is the fulfilling the *Will* of a Perſon, and that which is

the

the Payment of what was owing by an *Equivalent* otherwiſe not due. And he affirms, that Chriſt's Satisfaction was not a mere fulfilling the *Will* of God (tho it ſuppoſeth his Conſent;) but it was a *full* Equivalent to what Puniſhments we deſerved, in that it better anſwered the Ends of Divine Government, than the Sinner's Puniſhment would have done; it more fully demonſtrated the *vindictive* Juſtice *of God*, than if the Sinner had been damned, and it was a *full Satisfaction* to governing Juſtice, and the End of the Law. *Ubi ſupra Determ.* 10, 11, 12, 15.

I thought this account neceſſary not only for the forementioned End, but alſo that our Agreement in oppoſition to *Socinianiſm* might not exclude Mr. *B.* and ſuch as approve of his Scheme, which would add ſtrength to that Hereſy, and be injurious to many worthy Perſons; nor ought a few words ſo fully explained be preſſed to brand them with that *odious* Title, who could more plauſibly fix the ſame Character on Perſons from *things* plainly aſſerted in the Socinian *ſenſe*, and *ſubſerving* their *Hypotheſis*: As Chriſt's Death was not *neceſſary* to the remiſſion of Sin, the *Promiſe* of Forgiveneſs is no *Effect* of Chriſt's Death. Repentance *under* the Goſpel is an *Effect* of juſtifying Faith in Chriſt. The preaching of Reconciliation to Sinners, is only to publiſh to them that God is *already* reconciled to them, and to call them to be reconciled *to God*. Many others might be inſtanced; but I think it were unjuſt, even upon ſuch grounds, to call any of theſe *Socinians*.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

An Enquiry into what Difference ſeems to remain concerning the Satisfaction of Chriſt, and Juſtification of a Sinner. And this Difference reduced below any Cauſe of Diſcord.

I Think both ſides are acquitted from all *dangerous* Errors concerning the Satisfaction of Chriſt, and Juſtification of a Sinner; nor can I doubt but the impartial Reader muſt apprehend the remaining Difference doth not lie in Opinions about theſe Doctrines *themſelves*, but in accommodating ſome words in oppoſition to *other* Errors which either Side have more eſpecially applied their Minds to confute, unleſs he ſhould alſo aſcribe it to a Zeal for ſundry received *Phraſes* on the one part, and an apprehenſion in the other part, that more *accuracy* is become needful ſince thoſe Phraſes were received.

1. In both theſe Doctrines the viſible Spring of what Difference remains is a different Notion of Chriſt's *Suretiſhip*. For by this the word *Imputation*, as uſed in both theſe Doctrines, is governed, *viz.* how *our Sins* were imputed to Chriſt when he *ſatisfied*, and how *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs* is imputed to us when we are *juſtified*; both which depend

pend upon the various Conceptions of the *Suretiſhip* of Chriſt, and the manner of his repreſenting us, which I will begin with. One Side thinks him a *mediating* Surety, and diſtinguiſhing both as to the matter engaged, and Inſtrument wherein he voluntarily engaged himſelf, as alſo the reſpect he had to us therein.

1. In the Covenant of *Redemption* they conſider Chriſt agreeing with his Father the Terms of Satisfaction to Juſtice, and Impetration of Life for Sinners, and obliging himſelf to aſſume our Nature, and therein perfectly to obey the Law, die an accurſed Death, with whatever was *equivalent* to what by the Covenant of Works *our Sins* deſerved. Here they think Chriſt did not covenant *ſtrictly* in our ſtead, or as our *Proxy*, tho he covenanted *to die* in our ſtead, even *ſtrictly ſo:* He *tranſacted* as a free Interpoſer tho for our Salvation; we were no federating *Party*, tho we were the Perſons *whoſe Salvation* was his promiſed Reward: And therefore we have more reaſon, ſince we are become his Members, to ſay we intercede in Chriſt *now*, than to ſay that we covenanted in Chriſt *then*. Finally, they account his *Act* of engaging ſo peculiar to himſelf, that his non-performance of what he engaged (which was impoſſible) had not made us *more guilty*, tho it would have left us miſerable for *our* own Sins, there being no other way to redeem us.

2. They find Chriſt called a *Surety* in the *Goſpel-Covenant* made with fallen Man, *Heb.* 7. 22.

22. and no where elſe. This Covenant ſuppoſeth the former, yea ſuppoſeth Chriſt's having *executed* his Engagements by the Covenant of Redemption to make Satisfaction to Juſtice (*i. e.* it was at firſt accepted as if executed) for this Covenant with Man doth not adjuſt the *terms of Redemption*, but the *way* of conveying the *Effects* of that Redemption, and is called the *Teſtament* of our Lord Jeſus, whereby he bequeaths the Bleſſings he acquired by his atoning Death. In this Covenant Chriſt is ſuch a *Surety*, as not only aſſures us all will be performed which is promiſed to us on God's part, but that undertakes to bring in the Elect, and for the Perſeverance of Believers unto eternal Life, by his exerting that Power and Authority he hath received. But here alſo they apprehend Chriſt a *diſtinct* federating Party: A Mediator treating and obliging himſelf to make the *Covenant* ſtand ſure, and effect the Ends it was deſigned for: but he binds not himſelf to believe, repent, or perſevere *for us*; but that *we* ſhall repent, believe and perſevere; nor doth *his* Engagement that we ſhould do ſo, prevent *our* perſonal Engagement by Covenant to do it our ſelves, tho in *his Strength*. Now *our Act* of engaging is not *his* engaging Act, but an Effect of it; nor is our repenting his repenting Act, but the Effect of his engaged *Aſſiſtance*; nor is that Aſſiſtance of his *reckoned* to be legally our aſſiſting our ſelves; nor can we ſay that we covenanted *in Chriſt* to bring in the Elect, or that Believers ſhall perſevere: By which, with other Reaſons, we

are

are induced to think, that in covenanting he tranſacts ſtill as Mediator; but he *obliging* himſelf to theſe great Performances, in order to our doing what we are perſonally obliged to do, and our receiving what we are neceſſitated to receive, if ever we be ſaved even in a Goſpel-way (tho it ſuppoſeth him already crucified) he is properly called a *Surety of the New Covenant*, yet ſtill connoting him a *Mediator*.

I need not ſuggeſt, that if in this new Covenant Chriſt's Suretyſhip will not infer our being *one* fœderating Party with Chriſt, and hence that we covenanted *in* him; it will far leſs follow we did ſo in the Covenant of *Redemption*, which treated of things ſo improper to be once *propos'd* to us as undertaking Parties, much leſs as *Principals*, which to ſtrictly legal Sureties always are ſuppoſed. But of this I have treated in *Man made righteous*, and *in Anſwer to the Report*, and *P. S. to Goſpel-Truth*.

THE OTHER SIDE think Chriſt, with the Father's conſent, came into the Covenant of *Works* conſidered as a *Bond*, (as unviolated ſay *ſome*, as violated ſay *others*) and therein became *one* fœderating Party with us, (as *Elect* ſome ſay, as *Believers* ſay others) even *ſuch* a Surety as made the Covenant of Works run thus: If thou Chriſt my Son, *or* you the Elect (or Believers) do obey all the Law, you ſhall live: But if they ſin, thou *or* they ſhall die, or they having ſinned, thou ſhalt die. And they conceiving Chriſt to be as a ſtrict pecuniary Surety in this one Bond

with us, they eſteem him one legal Perſon and Repreſentative in ſuch a ſenſe as that we did covenant in him, and are legally eſteemed to do and ſuffer what he did, and not only ſecured of Salvation in his right, and for his ſake.

This may be accounted by ſome a *dangerous* Difference, and ſo it were *on our part*, if we did not own that Chriſt's fulfilling of the Law was an *Article* in the Covenant of Redemption; and that we are as fully *aſſured* of Salvation, if we accept of Chriſt, as if we had covenanted in him; and that he hath engaged the Elect ſhould *accept* of him, tho they did not covenant in him: and that Believers have as *inviolable* an Intereſt in the Benefits of Chriſt's Death, both in his right and by the Goſpel-promiſe, as if they were legally eſteemed to ſuffer what he did ſuffer. But all this we acknowledg. It would be as dangerous on our *Brethrens* part to ſay we covenanted in Chriſt, and obeyed in him, if they did not renounce all proud aſſuming Boaſts, as if they were *as* righteous as Chriſt, or ſtood on terms with God needing *no more Acts of Mercy* than that one of *appointing* Chriſt to be Mediator; but after that they are on terms of ſtrict Juſtice, and above Forgiveneſs, *&c.* The like Danger would enſue their Poſition, if they did not acknowledg the *neceſſity* of Faith to Juſtification, and this Faith to be always accompanied with Repentance and perſevering Holineſs. But our *Brethren* renounce the former, and own the latter.

Matters

Matters ſtanding thus, will afford no ground to hereticate each other: We think a mediating Surety obliged in a *diſtinct* Bond to perform the utmoſt which our Brethren affirm Chriſt to have done, doth *as well* ſecure our State, and ſupport our Faith as if in the ſame Bond, and better account for the ſapiential Methods of Divine Government towards Man *ſince* the Fall, with God's judicial Procedures towards Man as under *Goſpel-offers*, and his *ſuſpending* Chriſt's merited Benefits till Men believe, as alſo his recorded Pleadings with Sinners. The Brethren think not that Chriſt did more for our Salvation than we allow, but that we did more in Chriſt; and thence judg our Faith more ſupported, and the Law of Works more honoured in their way. But did each ſide perceive all the aforeſaid reſpective Ends alike provided for, and evil Conſequences equally avoided, the Notion in debate could for its own ſake admit no Diſpute on either ſide. And is it not pity to hate each other for miſtaking the beſt Scheme, to avoid the ſame *Evils* which both would prevent, and ſecure that ſame *Good* which both honeſtly aim at by their reſpective *Hypotheſes?*

Forbearance is the juſter in this point, becauſe it turns upon a Solution of this Queſtion, When *Adam* is called *a Figure of Chriſt*, *Rom.* 5. 18. is there not ſome *diſparity* in their Repreſentation of Men, as well as in thoſe other things there inſtanced? Our *Brethren* think Chriſt ſo fully prefigured by *Adam* as a *Repreſentative*, that we as truly obeyed and ſuffered in Chriſt, *as we ſinned in* Adam. We

think the *Figure*, as to Repreſentation, is to be explained thus: *As* no man becomes a Sinner, or dieth, whoſe Depravedneſs and Death were not procured and merited by *Adam*'s firſt Sin; and tho the Pagan Sinners who died, did not actually ſin againſt a revealed poſitive Law, as *Adam* did, yet he was the *Root* of Death to them as well as to the Jews under *Moſes*'s Law: *So no men* are quickned, juſtified, ſanctified, or ſaved, but *Chriſt is a Root* of Life, Grace, Juſtification, Holineſs, and Glory to them (in all theſe by his *Merits*, in ſome alſo by his *Spirit* and *Power.*)

But yet we conceive Chriſt may as well anſwer *Adam*'s *Figure* here intended, by our being quickned, juſtified, and ſaved by Chriſt's *Obedience imputed* to us, without our being *eſteemed* to have obeyed and ſuffered *in him*, as Chriſt was condemned and died for *Adam*'s *Sins imputed* to him, tho he was not *eſteemed* to have ſinned *in Adam.* As he was condemned *by our* Diſobedience, ſo we are juſtified *by his* Obedience, *viz.* the firſt by his own Compact with the Father, the laſt by that and the Goſpel too: He was not condemned by any imputation that made him by the Law a Sinner, unleſs he ſinned in *Adam*; neither are we juſtified by being legally judged *Sufferers* or *Obeyers* in him. It avails not to ſay Chriſt was legally a Sinner, and yet not reputed to *ſin in Adam*, becauſe Chriſt was our *Root*; for tho he was our Root as to Grace, Acceptance, Pardon and Glory, and whatever elſe did *proceed from him to us*, as our *Saviour*; nevertheleſs, if he was a *Sinner*, he could

could not as to this be our Root, unleſs we *derive* Sin from him; but ſurely that *Denomination* muſt have its Root, not in him, but in thoſe that were Sinners before him, and whoſe Sins were imputed to him: they muſt denominate that one legal Perſon *into* which he came, a *ſinful guilty Perſon*; as he doth that one *obeying*, *ſatisfying Perſon*, into which we are admitted: (which Terms our Brethren eſpouſing, I argue from.)

Finally, we are enclined to ſet the foreſaid Limit to Chriſt's Repreſentation by this among many other Reaſons: for in that *Rom.* 5. 18. where *Adam* is called a *Figure*, the Death of thoſe Heathens was *merited* by their *own* perſonal Tranſgreſſions as well as by *Adam*'s Diſobedience. But the Elect, even when *Believers* do not, *merit* Life by their own perſonal Obedience; and therefore we are not repreſented altogether in the ſame manner in Chriſt as in *Adam*.

2. From the former another point ariſeth referring expreſly to the *Satisfaction*, *viz.* in what ſenſe our Sins were imputed to Chriſt.

One ſaith our Sins were imputed to Chriſt only as to Guilt or Obligation, to bear the Puniſhment which we deſerved for them; which Puniſhments tho he obliged himſelf to endure in our ſtead to reconcile God to us, yet that did not render him a Sinner in God's account, becauſe that Title reſults from the violation of the Precept abſtractedly from a reſpect to the threatning; and conceiving he was not a Sinner in our ſtead, tho he ſuffer'd in our ſtead the puniſhments due to our ſins,

they think he was eſteemed by God what in truth he was, *viz.* the holy, innocent Mediator, puniſhable by his own conſent for the Sins he came to expiate, and were not expiable without his dying in our ſtead.

But our Brethren think our Sins were ſo imputed to Chriſt, as to give him the Denomination and judicial acceptation of a Sinner in the eſteem of God and the Law.

Yet leſt the difference ſhould appear greater than it is, it's fit I inform you that our Brethren deny that Chriſt had any Sin or Defilement in him, or had any Sin of his own: they were our Sins, only *imputed* to him, and he was a legal Sinner by being one *political Perſon* with thoſe Sinners whom the Law eſteemed real Sinners, and condemned as ſuch.

On the other hand, we own that (ſuppoſing the Covenant of Redemption) he was as truly *obliged*, and God the juſt *Rector* at as full liberty to puniſh him for our Sins, as if he had been reputed a *Sinner*: Nay Divine Juſtice *required* the inflicting thoſe Puniſhments on him, if the Sinner was to be redeemed from them for his ſake.

Now, Reader, can this difference juſtify mutual Cenſures or Alienation? What, is a Sinner without Filth, yea or any Fault of his own, above a Sponſor obliged to bear the Puniſhments of other mens Sins in the ſtead of the Offenders? And they who acknowledg him to be this, what leſs ſay they of him than the others mean, tho ſcrupulous of that harſher Denomination? At leaſt it would appear

appear ſtrange to revile each other for a different explication of that Text, 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. *he was made Sin for us.* One thinks he was made a *Sacrifice* for Sin after the *Hebrew* Cuſtom: for we find very oft the words אָשָׁם and חַטָּאת to ſignify a *Sin-Offering* as well as Sin, *Lev.* 7. 1, 2. and *cap.* 4. 28, 29, 33. And this very Apoſtle follows the ſame Uſage, calling an Offering or *Sacrifice* for Sin περὶ ἁμαρτίας, *Rom.* 8. *Heb.* 10. 5. The other ſide will have it meant that Chriſt was made a Sinner, but a Sinner that's holy, undefiled, and never offended: which Notion of being made Sin is too diminutive to admit harſh thoughts of ſuch as entertain it.

An unconcerned Obſerver will be apt to ſay, Theſe who call Chriſt a Sinner are intent to *renounce* Socinianiſm; and they who call him a Sacrifice for Sin, are as ſollicitous to *confute* Socinianiſm and *Antinomianiſm* too, by withholding an advantage which both theſe Errors receive by the uſe of that Word. But where's the Chriſtian Charity or Prudence of the *condemning Side*, when both contend for what ſeems the beſt Defence of the Doctrine of Satisfaction? The other Phraſes accounted for in the 6*th* Chapter, admit the ſame Mitigation as this, and upon the ſame Grounds.

3. The third point wherein there appears ſome difference, refers to the Doctrine of *Juſtification.* But before I inſiſt on this, permit me to offer a few hints.

1. Any Difference in this matter ſeems to proceed from want of an equal Conſideration of the Covenant of *Redemption*, which fixed

the terms of Satisfaction, and Impetration of ſaving Benefits, which Chriſt *alone* was thereby obliged to perform; and the *Goſpel-Covenant*, wherein the Method of giving us a perſonal Intereſt in the Bleſſings impetrated by Chriſt is ordained. By the former, all that belongs to Satisfaction and Merit are confined to Chriſt, and Pardon, Adoption, and eternal Life put in the hand of our Saviour as his Reward. By the latter, a way becoming our fallen State and rational Nature, is appointed to apply to us a Right to the purchaſed Bleſſings; nor can the Scripture-Account of God's Calls, Pleadings and judicial Proceedings be explained without it. I think the not diſtinguiſhing theſe two Covenants, or fixing the Mind upon either of them, with too little regard to the other, contribute much to our Debates.

2. With Humility I propoſe to Conſideration, whether ſuch can *dangerouſly err* as to the way of Salvation, and particularly in the Doctrine of Juſtification, who do honeſtly adhere to our foregoing account of Chriſt's *Satisfaction*; and in ſubordination thereto, aſſert a *Goſpel-Law* or Covenant, wherein is enacted a Rule by which the ſaving Effects of that Satisfaction are given forth: it ſeems to me highly improbable. For in the account given of Satisfaction, we aſcribe the whole Impetration of Pardon, Acceptance, and all ſaving Benefits only to the Atonement and Merits of Chriſt, expreſly excluding all our own Graces and good Works from the leaſt place therein: And by our Judgment of the Goſpel-Law, we

ſe-

ſecure the Method and Rule of the perſonal Application of theſe merited Benefits, and that conformably to the ſcope of the Bible in its moſt explained Parts, as well as in full conſiſtency with an apt Miniſtry, and a judicial Sentence againſt impenitent Infidels, to whom thoſe Benefits are not applied, notwithſtanding Goſpel-Offers.

Whereas if we conceived never ſo fitly and with greateſt Soundneſs concerning the *Satisfaction* of Chriſt, and denied a Goſpel-Law (or what's *equivalent to it*) we apprehend no ſmall Danger inevitably to enſue; and that in no leſs a matter than Mens Salvation: for if this Goſpel prove a *Rule of Judgment*, and that Chriſt gives forth Pardon and ſuch merited Benefits thereby, will not our *Miniſtry* be uſeleſs and enſnaring to Souls, which doth not explain and preſs the Goſpel-*Conditions* in order to an Intereſt in thoſe Benefits? And muſt not thoſe ſecure Sinners be deſtroyed who ſubmit not to thoſe Conditions, however confident they be upon Orthodox Apprehenſions of what Chriſt hath done to ſatisfy Juſtice, and merit eternal Life? The *Boundaries* therefore I would propoſe to my ſelf are, that Chriſt be not *rivalled* in his atoning or meriting Performances on the one hand, nor *rejected* in his enacted Rules of diſpenſing his purchaſed and offered Benefits on the other: for he is truly diſhonoured, and Souls undone by both. But I would not be miſtaken, as if this were ſuggeſted to reflect on the Brethren who are ſeriouſly intent upon the firſt; for it already appears, and

will be more evident that they neglect not the laſt, but affirm what to this purpoſe is *equivalent* to a Goſpel-Law.

3. It is very evident that when *Proteſtants* expreſs great Zeal for Chriſt's *alone Righteouſneſs* imputed to us in Juſtification, againſt the *Popiſh Doctrine*, the generality of the Learned among them do only exclude every thing beſides that Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, from being *meritorious* of Acceptance, Pardon, Life, and any other Bleſſing; and from being any Satisfaction or *Compenſation* for any Sin; affirming that this alone can atone the *Anger* of God, *for the ſake* of this alone will he abſolve us, and nothing below this is perfect enough for us to ſtand in before the Bar of his Juſtice. And therefore the *Work* of Faith it ſelf can be no juſtifying Righteouſneſs in that ſenſe they took juſtifying Righteouſneſs (all which we heartily own;) and hence they oft appropriate the juſtifying Aptitude and Office of Faith moſtly to a *Reliance* on that ſole meriting Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and its *receiving* Forgiveneſs, Acceptance, and a Right to Life, of meer Mercy, for the ſake of Chriſt's alone Merits: All which is juſtly and truly ſpoken, as they accommodate it to the defence of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, as the only thing appointed or fit for the foredeſcribed Purpoſes, and in oppoſition to the *Popiſh* Doctrine of *Merit*.

The Diſpute they had with the *Popiſh Church* was about this meriting, atoning, ſatisfying Righteouſneſs; and you'l find them often propoſe that if the Papiſts would grant that this Righteouſ-

Righteouſneſs was that of *Chriſt alone*, the great Controverſy about Juſtification was at an end: But at the ſame time moſt Proteſtants, and our *Homilies* do fully grant, that Repentance was neceſſary, and required to Forgiveneſs, and Faith to Juſtification, and theſe Bleſſings promiſed to thoſe Graces, tho they were not led to diſpute whether theſe were to be called a Righteouſneſs as qualifying the *Subject on whom* God's juſtifying Act terminated: But whether in that Act God regarded any thing as a meriting, abſolving, ſatisfying Righteouſneſs, any thing as a *Satisfaction* to Juſtice, any thing as an *impelling* Motive, or valuable Conſideration, *beſides the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt*. To this their Debates were confined in their day, and this they were intent to maintain, as all Chriſtians ought to be: Whereas the reaſon of debating the *Name* of that by which the Subject of Juſtification was determined in oppoſition to ſuch whom God did not juſtify, was not ſo much before them as before others, of later years aſſaulted by ſuch as went into another *Extreme* from the Doctrine of Popiſh Merit.

Nor was this matter otherwiſe ſtated by our able Divines who contend againſt ſuch *Arminians*, as affirmed the *Tò credere*, to be our juſtifying Righteouſneſs; for by Righteouſneſs ſuch *Arminians* mean the Righteouſneſs which is *part of Payment*, and ſtands in the place of, and anſwers the *ſame* Ends in our Juſtification, as perfect Obedience ſerved for to ſinleſs Man; which we have before

ſtated

ſtated and renounced. Were there need, abundant Teſtimonies offer by which this Head is eaſily proved, tho I grant ſome Men may be found to vent ſome *inconſiſtent* Expreſſions. Having premiſed theſe things, I reaſſume the Difference about Juſtification that ſeems to continue, which lies,

1. In *the manner* of the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs. Both agree it is imputed, but *how*, is not ſo univerſally aſſented to: *One ſide* thinks the ſenſe of imputing Chriſt's Righteouſneſs to be, that God reckons us to have legally done and ſuffered what Chriſt did, and this to the full Satisfaction of Juſtice and the Law of Works, and therefore are reputed to have perfectly obeyed the Precepts of this Law, and fully endured its Curſe; and for our *legally* doing ſo, God judgeth and pronounceth us righteous in full Conformity to the Law, and therefore entituled to Pardon, Adoption, and eternal Life. If you ask, Is this juſtifying Sentence the Sentence of the *Law of Works*, *viz.* its premiant Sanction applied to us by God as the righteous Judg judging us by the Law of Works? They anſwer, It is the Sentence of the *Law of Works*, but it is of Goſpel-Grace that God allowed Chriſt to be *one Perſon* with us in the Covenant of Works, whereby we are thus accounted to obey and ſuffer in him. But others think that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed in the following manner, *viz.* 1. They conſider that the Father promiſed to Chriſt in Reward of his Obedience and Suffering, that they who believed

believed on him ſhould be pardoned, adopted, dealt with as righteous Perſons who had not ſinned, and be eternally ſav'd: Hence the *Lord Jeſus* has a right to Believers obtaining theſe things. And as Faith *deſcribes* the Perſons in this Covenant who ſhall obtain them, ſo when we become Believers, we are accounted and adjudged to be ſuch Believers, and ſuch as are to obtain thoſe Bleſſings in Chriſt's Right.

2. They conſider God in Chriſt for ſapiential Ends, making in the Goſpel an *Offer* of Pardon, Adoption, and eternal Life to poor Sinners if they believe, and promiſing theſe Bleſſings *when* they believe, and ſtill as Bleſſings *bought* by Chriſt's Obedience and Sufferings, and *promiſed* to him for Believers; tho withal uſed in his Goſpel as *Motives* to inforce his Command of Faith and Calls to it. Theſe things thus conſidered, we apprehend that when God in Chriſt juſtifieth us, he doth not only give us Pardon, Adoption, and Life; but he *adjudgeth* and ſentenceth us to be the Perſons that by the Covenant of Redemption were to be pardoned, adopted and ſaved in the *right of Chriſt*; and *to whom* the Goſpel by its Promiſe gives a *perſonal* Right to that Pardon, Adoption and Life as purchaſed by Chriſt: And he eſteems and adjudgeth that the Obedience and Sufferings of Chriſt in their full virtue, is our *pleadable Security* for the enjoyment of them, whereby we have a right to *plead* his Death and Merits with God as what procured theſe for us, as well as God's *Fidelity*, who promiſed them to us in his Goſpel.

You

You ſee by this account that we riſe not ſo high as to ſay, we are accounted to do and ſuffer what Chriſt did, and to be abſolved *immediately* by the Sentence of the Law of Works; nor fall we ſo low as a mere Participation of the *Effects* of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, but aſſert an *Imputation* of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs it ſelf *relatively* to thoſe Effects. Chriſt's Right is applied, and his very Obedience reckoned to us, as what *pleads with God* for thoſe Effects, and ſecures us againſt all condemning Obſtacles and Challenges. The juſtifying *Sentence* is not the Sentence of the Law; God ſaith not, *You* have perfectly *obeyed*, therefore you ſhall *live*; *you* have *ſatisfied* the Curſe, therefore you ſhall not die: Yet the Righteouſneſs which procured our Salvation, and is our adjudged pleadable Security of enjoying this promiſed Salvation, includes an *Obedience* as perfect as that to which the Law promiſed Life if we had *not ſinned*, and *Sufferings* equivalent to what the Curſe pronounced againſt us when we ſinned. But becauſe we apprehend not where this Law includes ſuch a Sentence as this, *viz.* becauſe *Chriſt* obeyed, *you* ſhall live tho *you* obeyed not; and becauſe *Chriſt* who ſinned *not*, did ſuffer for your Sins, *you* ſhall be abſolved tho *you have ſinned*; therefore we rather conceive the *juſtifying Sentence* to be the Sentence of the *Goſpel-Law*, yet connoting the *Law of Mediation*, and preſuppoſing a Satisfaction made to the *Law of Works*, which we conceive to be to this purpoſe. Thou believing Sinner, I judicially eſteem and pronounce

nounce thee to be one that I promiſed *to my Son* in the Covenant of Redemption, to pardon, adopt and glorify in Reward of *his* perfect Obedience to my Law, and Satisfaction to my Juſtice, which I acknowledg he hath performed: As alſo to be one of thoſe Perſons to *whom* I made a Promiſe of Pardon, Adoption and eternal Glory, when I *offer'd* theſe Bleſſings to all Sinners who *would believe on him.* Thou art therefore in the virtue of the Promiſe made to Chriſt, and the Promiſe made thee, adjudged *to receive* Forgiveneſs, Adoption and Glory, and to have *a right to plead* the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt for thy ſafe and comfortable Enjoyment of them in the prevailing Efficacy of his Merits, who alone procured both theſe Bleſſings, and that *Faith* upon which thy *Eſtate* is ſo much altered. Charity obligeth me to think that ſome well-meaning Perſons who talk of *eternal* Juſtification in Chriſt, intend no more than this Promiſe made to Chriſt in the *Covenant of Redemption:* and by not diſtinguiſhing between this Promiſe, that *all who ſhould believe* on him ſhould be juſtified; and that other Article, all the *Elect ſhall* believe on him (which is a diſtinct thing) they conſider not that by the firſt no Man can be juſtified *till* he be a *Believer*; and the laſt Article only aſſures that the *Elect will be* Believers, and by the Conſequence of the *firſt* that they ſhall all be juſtified, but yet not *before* they are Believers. *Iſa.* 53. 10, 11. *He ſhall ſee his Seed*, and *by his Knowledg* (or Faith in him) *he ſhall juſtify many*, are

not

not the ſame thing: The *former* aſcertains the Elect ſhall believe, the latter that they ſhall be juſtified *when* they believe; nor could it be otherwiſe even when Chriſt upon the *Croſs* paid that for the ſake of which theſe Promiſes were made to him; he muſt then purſuant to the Compact die, that Believers might be *juſtified*, and the Elect become *Believers*, otherwiſe the Articles of the Covenant of Redemption muſt be altered, and not direct his engaged Performances and Rewards; nor can I chuſe but wonder to ſee our Divines in their Diſpute againſt the *Papiſts* proving that Juſtification is a *forenſic* or judicial Act, and yet find many uſing terms ſo *improper* to ſuch an Act, and omitting, yea condemning thoſe which are *proper*.

But to digreſs no further; you ſee what is this part of the difference about Juſtification; yet remember our Brethren do not ſay we our ſelves did *perſonally* obey or ſuffer, or are reputed ſo to do, but are reputed to have done it *in Chriſt*, who was one legal Perſon with us in the account of the Law; nor do they deny the Pardon of Sin, but own it, whatever others think of the difficulty of reconciling ſuch things; they do deny alſo that we can be ſaid to *ſatisfy* in Chriſt, tho we died in him, or that we *merited* in him, tho he merited. Further, there's no difference about the *Effects* of the imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, nor yet about the Righteouſneſs it ſelf as including both his *active* and paſſive Obedience, nor the *time* of its Imputation, *viz.* when we believe.

And

And ſhall we condemn each other notwithſtanding this Agreement in almoſt every thing beſides the manner of Imputation, and this is about what God accounts *us* to have done in Chriſt, and not what *Chriſt* hath done for us? Shall Men rend each other, becauſe one thinks there *can* be no Imputation beyond what he grants; the other ſuſpects it is not an Imputation unleſs it be in his words; and yet both grant an Imputation effectually available to *all* the ſame real Purpoſes, *viz.* the Honour of Chriſt and Grace, the Accompliſhment of God's Decree, and the Acceptance and Salvation of Believers, as if they had never been unrighteous, with ground of believing hopes about it equally ſtrong and quieting?

2. The other *Point* undecided is, what *Title* or *Name* we ſhould give to that Faith which is required in the Perſon on whom God's juſtifying Act doth terminate: our Brethren ſcruple our calling it a Qualification, a Condition or a Righteouſneſs. Others of us think each of theſe properly aſcribed to it, a *Qualification* as it diſtinguiſheth one Man deſcribed by the Word, which declares who ſhall be juſtified, from another who, according to the Rule of the Word, and the Incongruity of the thing, is not to be juſtified, unleſs the Divine Perfections and the Methods of Grace ſhould be reflected on; for by the Goſpel-Rule he that hath not Faith is to abide under Wrath. And how unbecoming and of ill Conſequence would it be to entitle a Man to Glory, and receive him

him to favour for Chriſt's ſake while he rejecteth Chriſt, and is reſolved to tread under foot his Blood, tho it's from God's Promiſe and not any Merit of Congruity that the Accepter of Chriſt ſhould be juſtified? They call it a *Condition*, not to ſignify any *Merit* or *Compenſation*, which they abhor, but to connote God's *Offers* of theſe Bleſſings to *more* than do accept of them, as alſo a Divine *Authority* injoyning a Compliance with the Terms on which the Bleſſing is offered, tho that be no more than a *meet Acceptance*. And to ſhew the *manner* of God's conferring them upon that Acceptation, they think it may be called a *Goſpel-Righteouſneſs*, not as meritorious of the Bleſſing, no, nor a *full* Conformity to the Goſpel-Precept, but as it is the *performed Condition* of the offered Benefit according to the Tenor of the Goſpel-*Promiſe*, which always ſuppoſes Chriſt's Satisfaction, and his paying the impetrating *Price* of all ſuch offered Bleſſings.

And they are more induced to account the performed Condition a Goſpel-Righteouſneſs, becauſe the Goſpel ſo very often ſpeaks of a *ſubjective* Righteouſneſs *in us*, and denominates *imperfect* Men *righteous* ſo expreſly with reſpect to that Righteouſneſs: they alſo think that this cannot be from Obedience to the *Law of Works* unleſs it were *perfect*, which it is not, nor yet from *full* Obedience to the *Precepts* of the Goſpel, which enjoyn no leſs as a *Duty* than doth the Law it ſelf; therefore they can find no ground of that *Denomination*, beſides a Conformity to what the Goſpel-

Goſpel-Promiſe appointeth as a *Condition* of the Good it entitles a Perſon to; yet ſtill as a means of giving us in a way of *governing Grace* what was promiſed *to Chriſt* for us, as a Reward of his full Satisfaction to *Legal Juſtice.*

But our Brethren think theſe Terms too high, and prefer calling Faith an *Inſtrument*, as many Proteſtants do, who alſo call it a *Condition:* Some chuſe to call it a *means*, I ſuppoſe to note a *phyſical* Influence in oppoſition to what's *moral*, and expreſſive of any Law; both which by the way we apprehend an aſcribing much more to Faith than we dare, becauſe it makes Faith efficacious from its *natural* Aptitude and Activity, without a Divine *Ordination* of it to that end by any *Promiſe.*

The Reaſon of any Debate concerning theſe Expreſſions lies in this: Our Brethren conſider all the Goſpel-Duties and Benefits as a mere phyſical *Order* of Bleſſings decreed by God to the Elect; and ſo one is given before the other, according as the Goſpel deſcribeth that Order: We grant the ſaid *Order*, and ſhould inſiſt on no more were not the Benefits offered to *more* beſides the Elect, and ſtill uſed as *Motives* to induce Men to ſubmit to thoſe Duties, and this by *Promiſes* of the Benefits *if* the Duty be performed, and *Threatnings* of withholding the Benefits with additional Miſery to be inflicted if they be not performed, with an account of *judicial* Proceedings towards Men with reſpect to their performance or non-performance of the ſaid *official* Terms. But things

things being thus, and ſo very apparently the Indications of *governing* Methods, and the Aptitude of our *Miniſtry* for Converſion and Perſeverance ſo much depending upon the affecting of Mens *hopes and fears*; we are forced to own that the Goſpel is not *only* a deſcription of the foreſaid Order, but that it is a *Law of Grace* ſubordinate to the Covenant of Redemption.

Yet that none may ſuſpect the difference above what it is, I ſhall recite what our Brethren grant in their *Declaration*. They ſay, *p.* 13. *We are true Owners of Juſtification at the inſtant when we believe.* P. 15. *It muſt be ſaid that even in* foro Dei, *in God's Court, and according to the Judgment in that open Court which God hath ſet up in his Word; and according to the Proceedings of his Word (which is the Rule he profeſſeth to judg Men by, and therein he keeps to the Rule of his Word; as Chriſt ſaith,* I judg no Man, but the Word that I ſpeak ſhall judg you, *Joh.* 12. 47, 48.) *God doth judg and pronounce his Elect ungodly and unjuſtified till they believe.* All theſe are the words of Dr. *Goodwin*, which they approve of, and note that he in *vol.* 2. *of the Creatures, lib.* 2. *cap.* 7. *p.* 51, to 63. proves at large, that Faith in Chriſt is of *another kind* than the Faith required by the *Law of Works.* They alſo ſay, *p.* 46. *God in the Covenant of Grace freely* offereth *unto Sinners Life and Salvation by Jeſus Chriſt*, requiring *of them Faith in him that they may be ſaved.* Note the Aſſembly of Divines in *Weſtminſter*, larger Catech. *Q.* 32. add re-

requiring Faith as the Condition *to intereſt them in Chriſt.* And leſſ. Cat. *to eſcape the Wrath and Curſe of God due to us for Sin, God requireth Faith in Jeſus Chriſt, Repentance unto Life,* &c. And in the *Savoy* Confeſſion as well as theirs, *Cap.* 18. *S.* 2. The *true Believer's Certainty of Salvation is not a bare conjectural and probable Perſwaſion grounded upon a fallible hope, but an infallible aſſurance of Faith founded upon the Divine Truth of the Promiſes of Salvation, the inward Evidences of thoſe Graces* unto which *theſe Promiſes* are made, *&c.* Of all which our Brethren have approved. To add no more, they declare *p.* 47. it's an Error, *That continued Repentance and Holineſs are not in the nature of the thing, nor by the Conſtitution of the Goſpel, neceſſary to our being poſſeſſed of eternal Life:* And may it not be ſuppoſed that *nor* is put for *and?* Alſo that *neceſſary by Conſtitution of the Goſpel,* as diſtinguiſhed from neceſſary in the *nature of the thing*: Some of them may mean an authoritative or *rectoral* Conſtitution, *i. e.* this Order is appointed by Chriſt as our *Ruler,* wherein he hath *enacted* this Connexion, and *requireth* our Compliance.

Theſe things being put together, muſt acquit our Brethren from the imputation of rendering Faith, Repentance, or Holineſs, needleſs or uſeleſs to Salvation, tho they ſcruple to call it a *Goſpel-Righteouſneſs*; and we hope it may encline them to a forbearance towards us, who think theſe Conceſſions contain for ſubſtance all that we intend by the Terms, *Condition,* and *Goſpel-Righteouſneſs,* which we make

make uſe of as what do more exactly, comprehenſively, and to ſome purpoſes more ſafely expreſs what we conceive to be the true import of theſe Paſſages when connected, and which we approve of.

Yet to put things in a fuller Light, I ſhall repreſent the matter as it ſtands by the forecited Paſſages, to all which they declare their Aſſent *p.* 63. The Brethren affirm God in his Covenant *offering* Life and Salvation to *Sinners*, and *requiring* Faith in him that they may be ſaved; and this Faith in a Mediator commanded by the *Goſpel* (and not by the Law of Works, as Dr. *Goodwin* ſaith) with *Goſpel-Promiſes* of an Intereſt in Chriſt and his Benefits, and theſe are *made to this Faith*, (as a Condition, ſaith the Aſſembly of Divines) and this in ſuch a manner, that the Believer may have an *infallible* aſſurance of the Benefits upon an inward evidence of his having this *Faith*, as that Grace *to which the Promiſe was made*, wherein the ſaid Benefits were included. And alſo that this Goſpel includes that *Word*, which is the *Rule of Judgment*, by which Rule God judgeth that Man (tho *Elect*) who hath not this Faith, to be a Chriſtleſs, unpardoned Child of Wrath; and him who *hath* this Faith, to be a true *Owner* of Chriſt and Pardon: Alſo that Repentance is of ſuch neceſſity to all Sinners, that it as well as Faith, is *required* that they may eſcape, and *none* may expect to be pardoned in a *ſtate* of Unbelief and Impenitence; yea *continued* Repentance and Holineſs are *neceſſary* to our poſſeſſion of eternal Life. And all this to be neceſſary, not only from the nature of

the

the thing, but alſo by the *Conſtitution* of the Goſpel.

I apprehend this Account is ſo *equivalent* to a Goſpel-Law of Grace for all its great purpoſes, that I ſhall not be offended at what name they pleaſe to give it; and did not a fear of offending them prevent me, I would prove it to be all the Law of Grace which we aſſert; eſpecially if they would allow that when they ſay *God requireth Faith*, that Sinners under Offers of Life may be ſaved, it's upon his *Throne* (tho a Throne of Grace) that God in Chriſt requireth it, and from thence directs his Offers of Salvation to Sinners; and thence *ſentenceth* them who live under Goſpel-Offers by their aſſerted *Rule* of *Judgment*.

However, we have no reaſon to contend, eſpecially when both agree the Debate is about the Inſtrument of *Donation*, and the Qualification of the Subject to receive a *Gift*, and not about any thing that *meriteth* the Gift freely beſtowed on God's part, and thankfully and humbly received on our part. A low degree of Charity would make allowances on both hands, when the Difference is ſo minute. They ſeem jealous of the Honour of *Free-Grace* (yet owning Chriſt's Merits:) we are for Free-Grace in oppoſition to all *Merits* beſides Chriſt's, but not excluſively of all *governing* Methods in applying the effects of Free-Grace. They grant Faith in Chriſt is required, that we may be ſaved; we more expreſly ſay, it's by a rectoral *Authority*: they grant it ſo by the *Law of Works*; we ſay it's by a *Goſpel* poſitive Law, tho we grant when this

this *poſitive* Law requireth it, we are obliged alſo by the *general* Law of Nature to yield Obedience; yet not by the Law of Works, as ſpecified by *Adam*'s Covenant, which Faith in Chriſt was inconſiſtent with from the eſſential Nature of that Covenant. Our Brethren are watchful againſt any inherent Righteouſneſs of Man *mingling* with Chriſt's Righteouſneſs: We, beſides avoiding of that, are ſolicitous leſt men come ſhort of Salvation by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, through a neglect of what he *requireth* in all thoſe who ſhall be ſaved by it; and yet we declare againſt all things beſides Chriſt's Righteouſneſs to be any impetrating, ſatisfying, atoning, meriting or compenſating Righteouſneſs; and as Faith hath no ſhare or place in this Office, ſo *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs*, tho the ſole meritorious Cauſe, is not that which God by the Goſpel requires of Sinners that they may be ſaved by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt. Faith is that commanded Requiſite, and no more than that; its place is thereto confined: and therefore here's no *mingling* of our Righteouſneſs with Chriſt's, becauſe their Uſe, Place, and Offices be ſo very diſtinct.

They ſeem moſt afraid of *Popery* and *Arminianiſm*; and therefore keep to this ſenſe of being juſtified by Faith *alone*, *viz.* we are juſtified *only by Chriſt* believed on, or the *Object* of Faith only is imputed to us for Righteouſneſs. We are truly afraid of Popery and Arminianiſm, but not *only* of theſe, but of *Antinomianiſm* too; and therefore are intent to maintain *two* great Truths included in that

that one Sentence, *We are juſtified by Faith*, viz.

1. That the Believer is abſolv'd from Guilt, accepted into God's Favour, and entituled to eternal Life in and for Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, and neither Faith, nor any Grace or Act of ours make the leaſt *recompenſe* to God, or is the leaſt *Price* or *Merit* of Pardon or Life, or any *motive* inclining divine Juſtice to *promiſe* or *accept* us into his favour, or to treat us as *righteous Perſons:* This from our heart we own, and know that this is what ſound *Proteſtants* intended by it againſt the Papiſts.

2. Yet as God promiſed to *Chriſt* in the Covenant of Redemption, all Belivers ſhould be abſolv'd, *&c.* ſo in the the Goſpel-*Offer* of his Grace to Sinners, he *promiſed to Men*, that he would in and for the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, abſolve, accept, treat as righteous Perſons, and give eternal Life (already purchaſed by Chriſt) to every *true Believer*; commanding Sinners to *believe*, and *threatning* that if they believed not, they ſhould *remain* condemned, yea become ſubject to *ſorer* Puniſhments: And that he would *judg* them by this Goſpel-*Rule of Judgment*. Whence we are attentive to a *ſecond Truth*, *viz.* That God accepts and accounteth Faith a *performed Condition* of this Goſpel-Covenant, and upon it acquits the Sinner from the *Charge* of damning Infidelity, and adjudgeth the Believer, *qua* ſuch, in oppoſition to Infidels, to be, in *Chriſt's Right*, and by his Goſpel-*Promiſe*, entitled to a *preſent perſonal Intereſt* in the fore-

ſaid Abſolution, Acceptance, and Gift of eternal Life; yet as *procured* by Chriſt's Righteouſneſs *alone*, and applied for his ſake.

To add no more, our Brethren in the Doctrine of Juſtification almoſt confine their Regards to the Satisfaction of Chriſt, wherein Chriſt tranſacted with the provoked Juſtice of God: We, beſides that, conſider a propitiated God in Chriſt applying the effects of his Redemption to Men in a Method of governing Grace, but without any real difference in the Doctrine of Satisfaction; and withal ſincerely granting the Condition is *performed* in the Strength of Chriſt *freely* diſpenſed. Yet upon the whole they provide againſt carnal *Security*, and we againſt carnal Boaſting: They are far from deſigning to eclipſe the Glory of Chriſt, as *King*, *Lawgiver*, and *Judg*; and we as far from intending the diminution of his Glory as a *Prieſt*. How unreaſonable and unhappy would perpetuated Conteſts be where the Grounds pretended are of ſo little weight?

Thus I have inſiſted on what ſeems moſt like a Difference in the Doctrine of *Satisfaction* and *Juſtification*. Some weak perſons may think there is a great Controverſy, where I ſee nothing worth our notice, they will ſay. Some think we are juſtified by *one* Act of Faith, viz. *Reliance*. Well, but they ſay juſtifying Faith is *receiving Chriſt*, &c. as well as a Reliance. *Ay*, but a Man *ſees* only with his *Eye*, tho more is of the Eſſence of a Man: But I ſay no Man ſees without that which is of the *Eſſence* of his Eye. *Another* thinks juſtify-

juſtifying Faith *as ſuch* receives Chriſt only as a *Prieſt*; *others* ſay, it receives him alſo as a *King* and *Prophet*: yet the *laſt* ſay the convinced Sinner hath an *eſpecial* reſpect to Chriſt's *Prieſthood* as moſt agreeable to his preſent caſe; and the former will ſay its but an *hypocritical* Faith that receives not Chriſt as Prophet and King as well as Prieſt. Nay, its not the true Chriſt, the *anointed Meſſias*, who is received, unleſs it be as Prophet, King, and Prieſt, even *Chriſt Jeſus the Lord*. Ay, but ſome ſay *Repentance is an effect of Juſtification*; but there be very few of our *Congregational* Brethren of that mind, and I ſuppoſe they mean *Works* meet for Repentance, and not a change of the purpoſe of the heart.

Nay, but ſeveral ſay, *Faith alone is the inſtrument of Juſtification*; others make Repentance *the Condition of Forgiveneſs*. What then? ſeeing the firſt grant there is no juſtifying Faith *without* Repentance, and the laſt grant the *aptitude* of Faith to receive and acknowledg Chriſt (which I ſuppoſe they mean by inſtrument) is far greater than Repentance. But when both ſides conſider Faith as an *ordained* Condition as well as an Inſtrument, they'l ſcarce diſpute but that Repentance is a Condition of Pardon as well as Faith, unleſs they would agree to join them together by calling Faith a *penitent* Faith, or Repentance a *believing* Repentance; connoting at once a Sinner's purpoſe to *return to God* by Chriſt the Mediator, and his cloſing with Chriſt *the Mediator*, that he may return to God by him: tho I think the end is firſt agreed to, before

the way or means to that end is reſolved on or made uſe of.

Obj. But ſure there is a vaſt difference between thoſe who think we are juſtified by Faith *only*, and thoſe who think we are juſtified by *Works* as well as by Faith.

Anſw. 1. Not ſo very great; when both mean that we are juſtified neither by Faith nor Works, as the word *juſtified* is commonly taken: for both agree that we are abſolved, accepted as righteous, and entitled to eternal Life only for Chriſt's Death and Obedience, as the only meriting, ſatisfactory and atoning Righteouſneſs.

2. They who ſay it's by Faith alone that *we apply* this Righteouſneſs, do alſo grant that Faith is *not alone* in the perſon to whom God applies the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt; and when they apply it to themſelves, Repentance, Love, *&c.* are *Concomitants* with Faith: And they who think we are *juſtified by Works*, as they think *its God's* applying Chriſt's Righteouſneſs to us, and not *our* applying it to our ſelves, that is the great juſtifying Act; ſo they grant God juſtifieth us *as ſoon* as we repent and believe *with the heart*, and ſuſpends not a juſtified State, till *Works meet for Repentance* or the *Effects* of Faith are produced; yea, ſhould a man dy then, he would be certainly ſaved.

3. They who ſay its by Faith *alone*, acknowledg that *juſtifying Faith* will certainly *produce* good Works; and if *good Works* and perſevering Holineſs do not follow, it was a *dead* Faith; and becauſe *dead*, it never was

a

a *justifying* Faith, however men flatter'd themselves: Also that Mens *Faith*, tho not their Persons, is justified by their *Works*: yea the most Judicious own, that if Sin should reign in Believers, and they apostatize, they would be condemned, (tho the Promise of Perseverance make that impossible;) and therefore persevering Holiness and good Works so far *continue* their justification, as they prevent what would bring them into Condemnation; and Faith is the Condition of the Continuation of Justification. See Dr. *Owen* of *Justification*, p. 207, 208, 306.

On the other hand, they who say we are *justified* by *Works*, do account Works to be no more but the *executing* the fœderal *consenting* Act of Faith; and so its Faith exerting it self by various occasions: and considering that the Believer's not only forgiving his Enemies, but his persevering in Faith and Holiness, are plain Conditions in many *Promises* made thereto; and God pronounceth to Believers, that he will have *no pleasure* in any Man who drawerh back, and *he shall die* if Sin reigneth in him; *Heb.* 10. 38. *Rom.* 8. 13. *Mat.* 6. 14, 15. They conceive that by Perseverance in Faith and true Holiness, they are kept from being *chargeable* with final and total Apostacy, and from Obnoxiousness to the Evils denounced by the Gospel against *Apostates* as such, and are adjudged to be under the Influence and Safeguard of the Promises made to Believers as *persevering*: nevertheless they abhor a thought that Perseverance in Faith and Holiness, or any good

Work, is any meriting Righteouſneſs, or the leaſt Compenſation for Sin, or entitling Price of the leaſt Benefit; nor exclude they the need of multiplied and continued *Pardon*, or make they any Bleſſing *due of Debt*; but they rely *wholly* on Chriſt's Merits for theſe things, as the only procuring Cauſe; tho they are *affected* and *governed* by theſe places of God's Word, which are directed to Believers as part of his *Rule of Judgment*; well knowing that whatever Sentence the ſaid Words paſs in this Life, God executes in part now, and more at Death; but at the great Day it will be *ſolemnly* pronounced, and *perfectly* executed.

Theſe reſpective Conceſſions duly weighed, ſecure thoſe who ſay we are juſtified by Faith *alone* from the danger of *Licentiouſneſs*; and thoſe who ſay we are juſtified by *Works* alſo, from detracting from the *Honour of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs*, as having the *ſole* meriting, atoning Virtue and Efficacy in Juſtification; and do not only *grant* Perſeverance, but think theſe conditional Promiſes and Comminations are apt and *deſigned* means of it, in Subjects capable of moral Government, and whoſe *Warfare* is unaccompliſhed.

However ſuch different Sentiments may appear to others, I lay ſo little ſtreſs upon them, that I had not thought it worth my labour to have printed a Sheet againſt any man who confeſſed the neceſſity of ſaving Faith (as deſcribed in the Goſpel) to Juſtification, (Repentance and Love ſtill accompanying that Faith in the Object on whom God's juſtifying Act doth terminate) and the Uneffectualneſs of

of *Faith* to ſave any who neglected to perform good Works, and to perſevere in Faith and Holineſs. Such as granted but theſe things I had never wrote againſt for ſcrupling the *conditional* reſpect of them to the Goſpel-Law. But Dr. *Criſp*'s Notions I apprehended dangerous; and they ſo greatly prevailing, my Brethren thought my confuting them neceſſary at that time: whereas I had no purpoſe when I wrote againſt Dr. *Criſp*, to intermeddle with theſe other points; but ſome Congregational Brethren in their Attempts againſt my Book, did from a very few occaſional Expreſſions therein, accuſe us of *Socinianiſm*, *Arminianiſm*, and *Popery*: and that they might have ſome pretence to fix that Charge, they turned the Controverſy into theſe leſſer Matters, whereby I was neceſſitated either to inſiſt on them (however againſt my Will) or elſe abide under the foreſaid ſevere Imputation, to the prejudice not only of my own Miniſtry, but alſo of moſt of my Brethren.

CHAP. VIII.

An Attempt to accommodate the difference between ſuch as ſay Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is imputed only as to Effects, and not in ſe; *and thoſe of us who think it is imputed* in ſe.

FOreſeeing an *Objection* that will be improved againſt a peaceable Forbearance towards a number, however ſmall, and that Rigidneſs may include in that number whomever the Objectors ſhall diſaffect, it's of uſe to ſtate it.

Object. Granting the forementioned Points to be reduced below a Cauſe of *Diſſention*, yet the Difference cannot be compromiſed between ſuch as ſay the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt *is imputed* [*in ſe*] for Juſtification, and them who ſay it is *not* imputed *in ſe*, but *quoad effectus.*

Anſw. I think it may be accommodated; at leaſt ſo far as to cut off juſt Pretences for hereticating and dividing from each other: To which end I will conſider theſe ſeveral Opinions, and then reduce the difference.

Firſt, Among them who ſay Chriſt's Righteouſneſs *is imputed* [*in ſe*] there be two Opinions moſt noted, and whereto all others are reducible: Of both theſe I have already

ready treated ſo much, that little more is needful.

1. *Some* think the Elect are judicially, according to the *Law of Works*, accounted to have done and ſuffered in Chriſt all the Law demanded, both as the Puniſhment of Sin, and the Merit of eternal Life.

Such muſt hold that Chriſt's Death and Obedience are the *formal* Righteouſneſs of the Elect, and the formal Cauſe of Juſtification, and that from the firſt moment of their perſonal Subſiſtence; yea, and (except making Chriſt to be their Repreſentative) without any *Gift* of that Righteouſneſs, it being imputed not of Grace but of *Legal Juſtice*, as *Adam*'s Obedience had been if he had finally obeyed, and his Offence now is upon his ſinning.

There *are others* who are for this judicial reckoning Sinners to obey and ſuffer in Chriſt; but they hold they are not adjudged to have done this, till they are *Believers*; and then they are legally juſt before God, and as ſuch entitled to eternal Life. Theſe ſpeak more *ſafely*, but leſs *conſiſtently*; they limit the time, from a Conviction that the whole ſcope of the Goſpel muſt be contradicted, if Unbelievers do not *remain* condemned, and Believers *only* are juſtified. But yet it ſeems hard to apprehend, that God by the Law of Works accounts the *Perſon* of a Believer to have ſuffered in Chriſt, and therefore to be abſolved, whom yet he did not account to ſuffer in Chriſt while he was an *Unbeliever*, and therefore condemned him, and this by that very ſame Law which now acquits him.

I know, to make this conſiſt, it's offered that the *Elect* are not Chriſt's Seed *till* they become Believers. But this comes ſhort, for it will thence follow that Chriſt in his Death was a ſtrict Repreſentative, who perſonated Believers, [*qua*] *Believers*, which will induce ill Conſequences: And yet further, it is not true, that the Perſons of Believers were *ſeminally* in Chriſt when he died, as we were in *Adam* when he ſinned; and ſo no Argument can be brought from that Inſtance. I grant that both the *Merit* and the powerful *Virtue* whereby our Perſons in time obtain Faith, were in *Chriſt* before we were born; but that makes not Chriſt the Root of our *Perſons* at that time, but of that regenerating Virtue whereby we become Believers; and therefore tho as to this change of our *Qualification* we may be called *Chriſt's Seed* when we believe, yet it's not ſuch a Seed as it may be ſaid of, we ſuffered in him, as we ſinned in *Adam* who was the *natural* Root of our Perſons, and thereupon ſuch a Repreſentative as his Deſcendents ſinned in. What may be ſaid of Chriſt's *adopting* Merit will have no place here, for theſe Authors make Adoption to be an *Effect* of Juſtification, and ſo the Imputation is prior.

2. There be others who are for imputed Righteouſneſs *in ſe*, but cannot approve of the former manner of Imputation, among whom there is ſome variety in wording their Conceptions, but they come to one and the ſame thing, *viz.* that God adjudgeth the Believer to be one whoſe Abſolution, Adoption and

and Glory were *promiſed to Chriſt* in Reward of his Death and Obedience by the Covenant of Redemption, (which are promiſed alſo to the Believer *himſelf* in the Goſpel-Covenant) and for his actual Intereſt and Enjoyment thereof, as alſo Acceptance and Treatment as *a righteous Perſon*, againſt all Challenges, God judicially accounts what Chriſt hath done and ſuffered to be his *pleadable Security*: This we take to be Imputation.

Secondly, By the Opinion of thoſe who ſay Chriſt's Righteouſneſs *is not imputed [in ſe]* but only as to Effects; they in Expreſſions oppoſe all the forementioned account, denying that the *firſt* Head is true, and that the *ſecond* is any Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs *in ſe*. Nevertheleſs they grant that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is the meritorious Cauſe of our Juſtification by Faith, and ſeem to inſiſt moſtly upon its Efficacy to that end, as Chriſt's Satisfaction was the ground upon which God enacted the Goſpel-Covenant, wherein our Faith, tho imperfect, is accounted for Righteouſneſs. Concerning this Opinion I ſhall offer a few things.

1. None ought to narrow it, as if the Authors meant that Pardon and eternal Life are not merited by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt; for they affirm, that theſe and other *Goſpel-Bleſſings* are merited by Chriſt as well as the Goſpel-Covenant. Pray ſay not this; it's not only the Covenant it ſelf, but *thoſe very Bleſſings* which that Covenant conveys, that are the merited Effects of Chriſt's Death and Obe-

Obedience; they were his deſerved Rewards which are diſpenſed to us upon believing. This I inſert, to obviate a Conceit too much improved by ſome, ſo ſtupid, or worſe, that they will not own this Diſtinction, and ſtill cry out as if their Opinion confined the Influence of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs to the procuring of *a Law* whereby Men were to purchaſe Pardon and Life by their own Faith: Whereas they are ſo far from this, that they affirm theſe Bleſſings were already accounted purchaſed, and Authority in Chriſt to diſpenſe them before he could enact ſuch a Law.

2. They intend not to exclude Chriſt's Righteouſneſs from being imputed in any ſenſe; for they ſay it's imputed *quoad effectus*, and therefore ſhould not be charged to deny all Imputation, or repreſented to ſay, we are pardoned and ſaved for our own Works, without *any* Imputation of Chriſt's Death and Obedience at all.

3. In all which they affirm concerning Juſtification, they ſtill ſuppoſe Chriſt's complete Satisfaction, and are ſound therein: None can accuſe them to differ from the Orthodox as to Chriſt's expiating Sacrifice, or impetration of eternal Life.

4. I could wiſh a very worthy Perſon of this Opinion would review his own account of Juſtification, wherein he ſaith, it's *that Act whereby God imputes to every ſound Believer his Faith for Righteouſneſs upon the account of Chriſt's Satisfaction and Merits*, and *gives Pardon and Life as the Benefits of it*, i. e. of Juſtification, which he further explicates, —*Through*

—*Through Chriſt's Sacrifice the Defects of this Faith, which is our Righteouſneſs, are pardoned, and by his Merits that imperfect Duty is accounted or imputed to us for Righteouſneſs, which it is not in it ſelf.* Had I thus ſtated this Point, I ſhould ask my ſelf, Do not I ſet Pardon too remote from Chriſt's Sacrifice as the meritorious Cauſe? And how can Pardon be the Effect of imputing Faith for Righteouſneſs, (which is Juſtification,) and yet God cannot impute Faith for Righteouſneſs unleſs he firſt pardon its Defects for the ſake of Chriſt's Sacrifice? But the cauſe of my mentioning this Account follows.

5. They do affirm what amounts to a real Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs *in ſe*, at leaſt what ſuppoſeth this Imputation, and infers it to be neceſſary: For how by Chriſt's Merits can a Righteouſneſs in it ſelf *imperfect* be reckoned before a juſt God for our perfect Righteouſneſs, and yet thoſe Merits, for which it is ſo reckoned, not be imputed at all for Righteouſneſs to us who have that Faith? Would Faith be *no* Righteouſneſs, except the Divine Mind did apply the Merits of Chriſt to Faith to *make it* a Righteouſneſs, upon which I am accounted righteous by this Faith, and yet the Divine Mind not apply to me that Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, without which my Faith had left me ſtill *unrighteous?* whereas it ſeems undeniable, as far as Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is neceſſary to make my perſonal *Faith* my Righteouſneſs in God's account, that ſame very Righteouſneſs is neceſſary to make my *Perſon* righteous in God's account.

account. Moreover, they own that God *promiſed to Chriſt* in reward of his meriting Sufferings and Obedience, that all Believers ſhould be abſolved and glorified, and can they be adjudged to this Abſolution and Glory without a *judicial* acknowledgment that they are to be abſolved and glorified in that Right of Chriſt which reſulted from that Promiſe made to him? And can that be without an Imputation of thoſe Sufferings and Obedience of Chriſt which are rewarded in that *Right* of Chriſt, and thereby in thoſe *Bleſſings* wherein Believers have this judicially acknowledged intereſt? They alſo abhor a thought that our Faith can be preſented to God as any Righteouſneſs in *Satisfaction* to Juſtice, *Atonement* for our Sin, or the meriting *Price* of our Salvation: withal they grant there muſt be ſuch a Righteouſneſs, and that this was Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, and that our Sins are ſatisfied for, we receive the Atonement, are reconciled, and obtain the Salvation ſo purchaſed. Now is it poſſible that things ſhould ſtand thus, and Chriſt's Righteouſneſs not be imputed to us? Can our righteous Judg declare himſelf ſatisfied, atoned, and reconciled to us Sinners for the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and not impute to us that Righteouſneſs *in ſe*, as what he accounts a Plea for us in his account? Can we enjoy the *merited Effects* of Chriſt's Death, and that Death not be reckoned what ſecures to us thoſe Effects againſt the Challenges which the *Merits* of it were deſigned to anſwer? Finally, Do not theſe Divines oft reſt on and plead with

with God the Merits of Chriſt more immediately and directly than a denial of Imputation will admit? when they *reſt* on Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, and *plead* it with God for Pardon, (tho it's true we could not expect Pardon for it, were not Pardon promiſed for the ſake thereof.) I think their Minds oft act more directly and fully towards the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, than to intend it thus, *viz.* I truſt in Chriſt's Merits for Pardon, as that Pardon is the Effect of that Juſtification wherein our Faith is accounted through Chriſt's Satisfaction a Righteouſneſs according to the Goſpel-Covenant, which Covenant was procured by the Merits of Chriſt's Death.

I grant there may be uſe of this progreſſive manner of arriving at Chriſt's Death for ſupport of our Faith as we confine its regards to the Goſpel-Covenant, and examine our Intereſt thereby as a Rule of Judgment. But I humbly think that when we plead with God for Pardon for the ſake of Chriſt's Merits, we have a more direct Eye to the Covenant *of Redemption*, wherein a Pardon was promiſed to Chriſt for Believers in reward of his Death, and which the Goſpel diſtinctly expreſſeth in this, *viz.* That Pardon is granted for the ſake of Chriſt's Death, as what procured it *in ſe*, as well as what merited the Goſpel-Covenant, which is the Inſtrument of the Donation of it. And ſo by keeping our Eye on the Covenant of Redemption, we plead Chriſt's Right as more *immediately* imputable; and by keeping our Thoughts

Thoughts on the Goſpel-Connexion between Pardon and Chriſt's Death as the procuring Merit of it, we plead Chriſt's very Performances *mediately* imputed, *viz.* as our pleadable Security for our certain obtaining and ſafe enjoying the ſaid Forgiveneſs.

6. The Reaſons why theſe venerable Perſons are ſo intent to deny an Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs *in ſe*, are, 1. An apprehenſion that there's no ſuch Imputation, unleſs we are accounted by God to have done and ſuffered what Chriſt did, which would unavoidably induce the *Antinomian* Scheme as moſt conſiſtent. But that I deny to be the only import of that Phraſe; for when that Righteouſneſs *it ſelf* is imputed *relatively* to the ſpecial Effects of it, it's truly an Imputation of it *in ſe*; and whereas they of the other Extreme ſay, that its being a pleadable Security for our Pardon, is but an Effect; I anſwer, This Righteouſneſs it ſelf being that Security is an Effect of the Compact between the Father and the Son, and it's not this Effect is imputed, but the Righteouſneſs it ſelf, as ſuch; and by the ſame Rule, as they can deny it to be imputed *in ſe*, becauſe it's imputed as a pleadable Security, they may better ſay it's being imputed for Juſtification and for Atonement, *&c.* would make it to be no Imputation of it *in ſe*, for thoſe are but Effects, and that by virtue of the ſame Compact. 2. A Zeal for the Goſpel-Righteouſneſs *of Faith:* But that is very conſiſtent with the imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt; and tho both meet in our Juſtification, yet it's under very

very distinct Considerations, of which afterwards.

Nor can I forbear again to inform the World that both Extremes arise from too much disregard of the one or the other Covenants, wherein the Salvation of a Sinner is adjusted. These Brethren, forgetting the Covenant of *Redemption* to which the Gospel-Covenant is subordinate, too little mention the Righteousness of Christ; the other Brethren overlook the *Gospel*-Covenant, and darken a Gospel-Righteousness of Faith: Whereas a distinct respect to the Rule of *Satisfaction* and *Impetration* on the one hand, and to the Rule of the *Application* of impetrated Benefits on the other hand, would put a Period to their principal Disputes.

From this Representation of the several Sentiments of the Brethren concerned in the Point before us, a mutual Forbearance seems no unjustifiable thing between them who differ most; and no considerable Disagreement remains between the others. 1. They who think the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness *in se*, is God's reckoning we did and suffered what Christ did, claim a tender regard from them who say it's imputed only as to Effects, for they disown the *Antinomian* Consequences of it, and abhor all Abuses of it to carnal Boasts and profane Libertinism, of which before: How unreasonable then were it to perpetuate Contests about this Point from the ill Consequences of it, when those Consequences are denied? On the other hand, it appears too like uncharitable

Rigid-

Rigidneſs for them to condemn as intolerable, ſuch who ſay Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is imputed only as to Effects: For whatever is the ſound of their words, they aſcribe nothing to Faith or Works which belongs to Chriſt's Righteouſneſs; nor do they detract from the Honour of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs any thing which theſe Brethren aſcribe thereto, and are Orthodox in the Doctrine of Satisfaction againſt *Socinianiſm* and *Popery*. When they ſay Faith is an accepted Righteouſneſs, mean they that it's a Satisfaction either to atone for Sin, or merit Life? No, they abhor it, and confine both to Chriſt's Righteouſneſs entirely: But they do not ſay *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is imputed*, that's not true, for they ſay it is imputed; Ay, *but not in ſe*. But ſhould that be ſo, would not it be far from a Chriſtian Spirit, to be implacable for not uſing a Phraſe which the Spirit of God makes no uſe of, who ſurely knew how to expreſs Truth as properly as fallible Men ſhould pretend to? *Yea, but the Scriptures ſpeak what amounts to this Phraſe.* And ſo do they in granting Chriſt's Righteouſneſs to be the only Atonement and meriting Cauſe of Pardon and Life, and Acceptance with God as righteous Perſons. *But do not they think we ſtand before God only in this Righteouſneſs of Faith, and not of Chriſt?* No; they aſſure us, that what Righteouſneſs Faith is, it's ſo by Chriſt's Sacrifice and Merits, and it's only a Righteouſneſs as a performed Condition of the Goſpel, deſcribing the Perſons who obtain that Salvation

vation which is the Effect of the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt; and whoſe Satisfaction ſtill interpoſeth between the Juſtice of God and a believing Sinner: Neither are they backward to aſcribe to efficacious Grace that Virtue whereby we are enclined and enabled to believe. Men may expoſe each other by fiery Debates after ſuch Conceſſions, but he who expreſſeth moſt Heat, diſcovers the more ungoſpel Spirit, if not the weaker Cauſe, and weaker Judgment.

2. As for ſuch who own Chriſt's Righteouſneſs *in ſe* to be imputed in the ſecond ſenſe, and thoſe who ſay it's not imputed in it ſelf but as to Effects; if they contend, the firſt muſt quarrel the other for denying in words what he grants for ſubſtance; and the latter muſt be warm againſt the former, becauſe he will not join with him in offending the weak, and hazarding Truth by rejecting a Phraſe, which, well explained, doth properly expreſs what both intend.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

An Abſtract of what helped me to avoid ſome Perplexity concerning Juſtification, with ſome account of our being juſtified at the Creator and Redeemer's Bar.

THO I avoid arguing any Controverſy in theſe Sheets, which are deſigned for Peace, yet I think it may promote this healing Deſign, to give a ſhort Abſtract of ſome Thoughts whereby I arrived to Satisfaction in the Doctrine of Juſtification.

§. 1. Juſtification being a *forenſick* Act, our Thoughts ought not to wander beyond what's neceſſary to it as a *judicial Sentence*, nor diſregard whatever belongs to that. Here the principal Conſiderations are the Judg, the Rule of Judgment, the Cauſe and Perſon to be tried by that Rule, and the Sentence to be paſt by the Judg on the Perſon whoſe Cauſe is ſo tried, which muſt be no other than what that Rule of Judgment, duly applied, containeth. Hereby what ſome call *Conſtitutive* Juſtification, is ſtrictly no other than the Conformity of the Perſon to the Rule of Judgment, by which he is acquittable or rewardable, or both. *Paſſive* Juſtification is no other than the Effect of the judicial Sentence, or the Perſon's State conſidered as abſolved, or to be rewarded, or both, by

by the Sentence now judicially paſt upon him, and ſuppoſeth a Sentence, and is meaſured by it.

§. 2. A juſtifying Sentence *is paſt* upon every juſtified Perſon, and *continues* to paſs upon him by the Goſpel-Promiſes applied by an Omnipreſent, All-ſeeing, Infallible, Faithful, Almighty God, *Rom.* 5. 1, 2. The Goſpel-offer is the *Rule* of Judgment, the Goſpel in its reſpective *Promiſes* complied with, is God's juſtifying Sentence, and that, concluſive and effectual, tho not ſo diſcernable by us, as if it were ſolemnly pronounced. 1. Here the tranſcendent Perfections of God muſt raiſe our Minds above Human Judicatories: he needs no *Evidence*, becauſe he knoweth all things; there needs no Summons to *appear*, for he is ever with us; he cannot *err* in Judgment, for he is inflexibly righteous, and knows the Rule of Judgment in its extent and allowances. 2. We know not what Solemnity this Sentence may be pronounced with *concerning us*, tho out of our hearing, what in *Heaven*, where there is Joy for the Converſion of Sinners; what at the *Throne*, where Chriſt is our interceding Advocate, *&c.* And ſometimes God condeſcends to make it audible to our own *Conſciences* by the received Teſtimony of his Spirit. 3. This Sentence is in part *executed* upon every Believer as to what is promiſed for the preſent, as well as his *Title* is adjudged to what is reſerved for the future. The in-dwelling Spirit, Aſſiſtances peculiar to Chriſt's Members, Anſwers of Prayer, the Comforts of the Holy Ghoſt, and

and whatever ſpecial Actings of Providence belong only to God's adopted Ones, are the Execution of the juſtifying Sentence, and ſuppoſe ſuch a Sentence paſt, as well as that it is a gracious one. 4. God ſtill pronounceth a juſtifying Sentence according to the *variety* of his Goſpel-Promiſes, tho that great one which *alters* our State paſſeth upon our firſt believing. As he adjudgeth us to Pardon and Adoption upon our firſt acceptance of his Grace, ſo he adjudgeth us non-forfeiters upon our abiding in Chriſt, or perſevering acceptance, inſtanced as the various Promiſes deſcribe the *Heirs* thereof.

§. 3. The *ſame* juſtifying Sentence that God paſt by his Promiſes applied by himſelf in this Life, will be more ſolemnly and convincingly pronounced at the Judgment-day, when the full and perfect Execution of the Sentence is to take place.

1. We ſhall be as *truly* judged at that day as if we had not been ſentenced, or the Sentence executed at all in this Life, or at Death. The wiſe God who knows the Subſerviency hereof to *Practical Religion*, doth oft and moſt expreſly deliver it, and in words as if we were all to be among thoſe found alive when the Trumpet ſounds. 2 Cor. 5. 10. *We muſt all appear before the Judgment-ſeat of Chriſt, that we may all receive*, &c. Rom. 14. 10, 12. *Every one of us ſhall give an account of himſelf to God*, 1 *Pet.* 4. 5. And what muſt we give an account of? *Our Words*, Mat. 12. 36. *Secrets of Hearts*, Rom. 2. 16. uſe of *Talents*, Mat. 25. Heb. 13. 17. *our Works*, &c. that

that is, every thing as gives Evidence concerning Mens Condition, as it's determinable by the Rule of Judgment, and principally centers in this, Have they *ſincerely accepted* of the Salvation offered by the Redeemer?

2. The Rule of Judgment and Sentence at that day will be *the ſame* as that by which every Believer is juſtified on this ſide Death; it's no new or other Sentence, but the ſame more ſolemnly declared, unleſs you'll ſay it includes the entire extent of the Rule for the time of trial, as well as that which changed our State.

3. The great deſign of that ſolemn Proceſs and open Sentence, is to vindicate God in Chriſt as *no Reſpecter of Perſons*, in the extremely different State of the Damned and the Saved, both in this Life and Eternity, eſpecially ſuch as lived under the offers of Salvation; and withal to vindicate his own myſterious Methods towards the Juſtified in their paſt Life, as alſo them from unjuſt Aſperſions, 2 *Theſſ.* 1. *Dan.* 12. *Mat.* 22. & 25. But to inſtance no more than the firſt, he'll convince Angels and Men by *manifeſted Inſtances*, that they whom he juſtified, and now ſaveth, were Perſons juſtifiable by that Rule of Judgment whereby the others are condemned; and that the Sentence he pronounceth and executes *on each*, is the very Sentence which that Rule impartially applied to their real Caſes denounced.

§. 4. The Rule of Judgment in its nature and ſcope is to be principally regarded in order to right Apprehenſions concerning the juſti-

juſtifying Sentence: This determineth what is a juſtifying Righteouſneſs, and what is not; this declares the nature of the adjudged Title, whether it be of Grace or Debt, dependent or independent; thereby is evident what we are adjudged to, and whether the Sentence paſſeth upon ſeveral complex Conditions, or one particular one; for we muſt be free from whatever the Rule of Judgment denounceth condemnable, and not be without what it confineth its promiſed Abſolution or Benefits to; ſeeing the Lord our Judg doth ſentence us as this revealed Rule takes hold of us.

§. 5. I find nothing plainer, than that on the one hand we are made righteous by Chriſt's Obedience, *Rom.* 5. 19. 2 *Cor.* 5.21. and accepted in the Beloved, *Eph.* 1.6,7. and waſhed from our Sins in his Blood, *Rev.* 1. 5. and we receive the Atonement, *Rom.* 5. 11. And on the other hand, that Faith is imputed for Righteouſneſs, *Rom.*4.9,11,22,24. and we are juſtified by Faith, *Rom.* 5. 1. *chap.* 3. 30. and by our words, *Mat.* 11. 37. and by our Works, *Jam.* 2. 24. and Men are called righteous with reſpect to their Graces and Actings ſhort of Perfection; and that Chriſt's judicial Proceedings are upon Mens Temper and Behaviour, *Mat.* 22. 25. *chap.* 10. 32. and Promiſes of Pardon and Life are made ſtill to Repentance, Faith, and Perſeverance; and the Goſpel denounceth Death againſt impenitent Ones, *Luke* 13. 3. Infidels, *Joh.* 3. 36. Diſobedient, *Rom.* 2. 8. Barren, *Heb.* 6. 8. Apoſtates, *Heb.* 10. 38. and Workers of Iniquity,

quity, *Luke* 13.27. Nor can it be overlook'd that Perfection is not intended in what the Goſpel-Promiſe is made to, nor is the Goſpel threatning of Damnation levell'd againſt any Offences conſiſtent with Sincerity. Hence I conclude, that when God juſtifies a Sinner, the Rule by which he judgeth requires a judicial regard to inherent Faith, *&c.*

§. 6. By one Rule of Judgment the ſame juſtifying Sentence, in all reſpects, could not be pronounced upon Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, and upon that of a believing Sinner, unleſs that one Rule did either,

1. Originally promiſe Life to *perfect* Legal Obedience, and alſo to that which was *not* a perfect Obedience to the Law: But if I ſuppoſe this, I muſt admit that the Law did not denounce Death for the leaſt Sin; for to condemn to Death for the *leaſt* Sin, and to promiſe Life to *imperfect* Obedience, conſiſt not: yea, I muſt then conſider God to enact that Rule of Judgment as in his *firſt* relation to innocent Man, *viz.* as *Creator*, governing by virtue of his abſolute Propriety in Man as his *Creature.* But if God be conſidered only in that relation, it was inconſiſtent with his *Perfections* to enact a Rule of Judgment which promiſed Life to any thing ſhort of *perfect* Obedience to the Law he delivered, and which Man was originally capable to obey. And moreover, we find in the Rule of Judgment, by which he now juſtifies Men, a direct reſpect to many things which that firſt Law was inconſiſtent with, as the Death of a Redeemer for our Sin. Faith in this

Redeemer, Pardon of Sin, and Abſolution from the Curſe which condemned us as Sinners, *&c.*

2. Or unleſs that one Rule of Judgment were the *Goſpel-Promiſe of the Redeemer*, viz. *He that believeth ſhall be ſaved.* Hereby indeed the juſtifying Sentence would directly paſs upon Man as a *Believer*, and adjudg him to a right in whatever the Goſpel promiſed to Believers, *qua* ſuch. And conſidering the chief deſign of the Goſpel is to induce fallen Sinners to believe upon a ſuppoſition and aſſurance given that *Satisfaction* is already made by our Redeemer, and not *now* to be made or adjuſted: Many are apt to confine their thoughts of Juſtification to this as the alone Rule of Judgment, and the account of the final Judgment generally ſtates it in this manner; nor can I deny but this is in ſome reſpects a ſafe as well as eaſy method.

But I cannot agree that the juſtifying Sentence is by this Rule ſo abſtractedly taken: For, 1. This would too much confine the Influence of Chriſt's Merits to the *mere* procuring of the Goſpel-Promiſe; whereas we find it more *immediately* and *fully* connected with Pardon, and all other ſaving Benefits. 2. We muſt be made *righteous* by Chriſt's Obedience in ſome way leſs remote than this. 3. The Satisfaction of Chriſt is not hereby ſufficiently *acknowledged* nor *applied* in our Juſtification. Many other Reaſons might be given why I am convinced, that when God juſtifies a believing Sinner, the Sentence reſpects

ſpects him under ſome further judicial Conſideration than merely a Believer; and conſequently the Rule of Judgment extenſively taken, required ſomewhat more to conſtitute him a juſtifiable Perſon.

§. 7. I therefore take the Rule of Judgment to be the Goſpel-Law in a ſubordinated Connexion with the Law of Mediation, wherein the Honour of our Creator governing us by the Law of Works is provided for, and the Ends of that Law fulfilled; and ſo the *Sentence* will reſpect the imputed Righteouſneſs *of Chriſt*, and the Righteouſneſs of *Faith* too; the *firſt* as ſatisfactory and meritorious with our injured creating *Lawgiver*, the *latter* as the performed Condition of the *Redeemer's* Grant of the bleſſed Effects of Chriſt's Satisfaction and Merits; and whereby *this* Man who believes is diſcriminated from ſuch who *rejected* the Offer of Salvation. In the *firſt*, Juſtice is ſatisfied that a *Rebel* ſhould be abſolved and glorified; in the *laſt*, the Rule enacted by governing *Grace* is anſwered by the Believer; ſo that the Judg is no more a *Reſpecter of Perſons* in *applying* theſe Benefits as Redeemer, than he was regardleſs of governing Juſtice in the Condition upon which they were *procured* by our Saviour.

§. 8. The *Rule of Judgment* then muſt be this: That the Believer (tho a Sinner) whoſe Abſolution, Pardon, Acceptance as righteous, and Salvation were promiſed *to Chriſt* by the governing *Creator* in reward of his Obedience and Sufferings, and promiſed to *himſelf* for the ſake of Chriſt in the Goſpel upon his

believing with that Faith which it appoints, is to be abſolved, pardoned, accepted as righteous, and ſaved.

From this Rule of Judgment is eaſily inferr'd that juſtifying Sentence on which our State is changed, *viz.* Thou art that *true Believer* whoſe Abſolution, Pardon, Acceptance as righteous, and Salvation were promiſed to Chriſt in the *Covenant of Redemption*, and to thy ſelf perſonally in my *Goſpel*; and therefore thou art *adjudged* abſolved, pardoned, accepted, and an Heir of Glory by virtue of that Promiſe made *to Chriſt*, and the Goſpel-Promiſe made to *thy ſelf*, and haſt a Title to plead Chriſt's perfect Obedience and Sufferings for thy certain enjoyment thereof, which will alſo be continually pleaded by Chriſt thy *Advocate*.

In like manner we ſee *Conſtitutive* Juſtification is our being made ſuch Believers, through the Influence of the Spirit of Chriſt, as fall under the foreſaid Promiſe made to Chriſt in the Covenant of Redemption, and the Goſpel-Promiſe made to our ſelves, and ſo are *conformed* to the Rule of Judgment, but yet conſidered as not *judicially ſentenced* according to it. Again, *Paſſive Juſtification* is no other than our Perſons and State conſidered as affected by that Sentence as already *paſt* upon us, *viz.* abſolved, pardoned, accepted as righteous, and intitled to Glory. Finally, *Executive Juſtification* is no other than God's dealing with us as Perſons ſo abſolved, pardoned, accepted and entitled to Glory, and his *performing* whatever is included in the juſtifying Sen-

Sentence, yet in the way, time, manner, and limits which the Goſpel declares.

§. 9. The Conſideration of the *Rule of Judgment* as before explained, led me to affirm that the Juſtification of a believing Sinner is *equivalent* to a twofold Juſtification, the one at our *Creator*'s Bar, the other at the *Redeemer*'s; the *firſt* by the imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, the *other* by that of Faith, which I have inſiſted on in *PS.* to *Goſpel-Truth*, p. 276, 279, &c. 3*d Edit.* And being deſirous to prevent Miſtakes in this Point, which I think is probable to prevent furious Debates concerning the Doctrine of *Juſtification*, I'll give a few hints of fuller Thoughts about it, premiſing only that I hoped none would think that I ſaid there is a *twofold* Juſtification, for I make the Sentence to be but *one*, tho that includes what's *equivalent* to a twofold Juſtification: Nor yet that I denied Chriſt as of one Eſſence with the Father to be *Creator*, or ſaid there be two actually *exiſting* Bars. But theſe are things too low for many words.

1. I conſider God at our firſt Formation as our *Creator*, governing Men by a Law ſuted to their rational, innocent and perfect Natures, by which Law he promiſed Life to *ſinleſs* Obedience, and threatned Death for *all* Diſobedience; God conſidered in this relation cannot be apprehended to enact a Goſpel-Law, with a Promiſe of Pardon and Life to the *imperfect*, tho ſincere, Faith of Sinners.

2. I conſider this Creator *offended* by Man's Violation of his holy Law: Under this Notion, 1. He condemns the Sinner unleſs *Satiſ-*

faction be made, and excludes him from Life unleſs *purchaſed* by one capable of meriting it. 2. He would reject Faith and every Work of a Sinner as *ſatisfactory* or *meritorious*, this Offendor being incapable to ſatisfy for the *leaſt* Fault, or merit the *leaſt* Bleſſing.

3. I conſider our *Mediator* tranſacting with our *offended creating Lawgiver* in the Covenant of *Redemption*; wherein, 1. Our governing *Creator* demands of Chriſt, if he would ſave Sinners, that in their Nature he muſt obey the violated Law, and endure Death, and what was equivalent to its threatned Puniſhment in their ſtead. 2. He declareth that this Obedience, and thoſe Sufferings of this Mediator, conſidering the *Dignity* of his Perſon, ſhould be accepted for *Satisfaction* for Sin and the *Merit* of eternal Life, and of whatever ſubſerved Sinners obtaining thereof. 3. He promiſeth Chriſt as a *Reward* of his Obedience and Sufferings, that whoever of fallen Men ſhould believe on him, ſhould be abſolved, pardoned, accepted as righteous, and eternally glorified for the ſake of what he was to do and ſuffer; and that a certain number ſhould believe on him, and ſo be abſolved, *&c.* to *his* Glory, and he have all Power, Authority and *Judgment* committed to him. 4. Chriſt our Mediator covenanteth to do and ſuffer what was propoſed, and accepts of the ſaid Rewards. 5. In due time Chriſt *performs* his Undertaking, and becomes entitled to the ſaid Rewards, and inveſted in a right thereto, with reſpect to which *he* is ſaid to be *juſtified*. 6. His Undertaking is allowed to *operate* as if

per-

performed, at leaſt from *Adam's Fall*; and thereby his Kingdom, and the ſaving Effects of his Obedience and Death antecede his obeying and dying. 7. Whatever concerned the Sinner's Salvation, was to be *founded* upon the ſatisfactory and meritorious Death and Obedience of Chriſt our Mediator. 8. *Man* is to be conſidered under the *firſt* Head as an innocent Subject in a ſtate of Trial, according to the Law of Works; and under the *ſecond* Head as a Sinner obnoxious to the *Curſe* of the Law, paſt Relief by his own Merit, and yet upon Chriſt's Satisfaction (purſuant to the Covenant of Redemption in this *third* Head) *as ſavable* notwithſtanding the *Curſe* of the Law.

4. As an Effect of this Tranſaction, I do not conſider only *Chriſt our Mediator* under the Notion of a Redeemer, as all will grant him to be in an *eſpecial* manner, becauſe he alone *paid* the redeeming Price: But I conſider alſo the *Creator* to be Redeemer as he gave his Son to be a Saviour, accepted the Satisfaction made by him, promiſed to him the foreſaid Rewards; and ſo far executed them as to inveſt him in his Office of an *accepted authorized* Mediator, admitting his Kingdom to commence (as well as his Death to operate to ſaving Effects) before he actually dy'd, *&c.* Upon theſe and the like accounts I apprehend the bleſſed God (conſidered *eſſentially*, tho the *Father* eminently bears the Title of *Creator*, and ſuſtains the Dignity of the Divine Eſſence and Government in *propoſing* the Terms, and *receiving* Satisfaction) to ſtand towards us in the relation

tion

tion of a *Redeemer*, who hath received Satisfaction, and tranſacting with us in and by our Mediator, in whom he is well pleaſed.

Our *Creator* being conſidered thus as *God in Chriſt*, who is ſatisfied as to the Violations of his Law, the Honour of his Government vindicated, and the Ends of it ſecured, tho Pardon and Life be granted to Sinners, it will follow, that in a conſiſtency with rectoral *Juſtice*, he can ſo far ſuſpend the *Curſe* of the Law towards ſinful Man, and exert his Mercy, as, 1. To be *willing* to *admit* to Peace and Favour all whom Chriſt ſhall preſent to him. 2. To be *ready* to forgive our Offences. 3. To make *Offers* of Peace, Pardon and Salvation to loſt *Sinners*, begging them to be *reconciled*, &c. 4. To return his expelled forfeited *Spirit* to ſtrive with and work on dead Sinners in order to their acceptance of this offered Salvation. 5. To be long-ſuffering, and waiting to be gracious in the uſe of fit Methods and Means to conquer their Reſiſtance. Theſe and the like immediately enſue upon Chriſt's Satisfaction; and if Men intend but Inſtances of this kind when they ſay God was reconciled to us by the Death of Chriſt *before* Converſion, we ſhould allow it: yet intreating them to *note*, that the Curſe *ſuſpended* thus far, and the Curſe *removed* by an actual *Intereſt* in ſaving Bleſſings, are very diſtinct, as be Forgiveneſs *with God*, and Forgiveneſs beſtowed *on us*; and yet I fear many do detract from this Benefit, *viz.* that there is *Forgiveneſs with God* for guilty *Sinners*, and *Salvation* for undone *Apoſtates*: this is *in it ſelf* a higher thing than that

that this or that Man is *Partaker* of it, tho our perſonal Advantage conſiſteth in the latter.

5. I conſider God in Chriſt *Redeemer*, *making* his offers of Salvation to Sinners, and ſtating the *Conditions* upon which he will give the merited Pardon and eternal Life perſonally *to them*, commanding their acceptance, with a *Promiſe* of applying Chriſt's Satisfaction in thoſe Effects upon their Compliance, and *denouncing* their abiding under Guilt and Miſery, with *ſorer* Puniſhments if they finally refuſe. This is by the Goſpel: To explicate which, *Note*, 1. Compliance is injoined by a *governing* Authority, tho with a diſplay of *Grace*; it ſuppoſeth Chriſt's *Sacerdotal* Offering over, and is an Inſtrument of Government reſulting from a *Dominion* acquired as Redeemer; and therefore may well be called *a Law*, yea, and that by which he will *judg* us. 2. The Hiſtorical *Account* of Chriſt's Offices, Fulneſs, Love, Death, and of Man's Miſery; the Diſplays of Covenant-*Benefits* preſent and eternal, Revelations of Divine Truths and Myſteries, Goſpel-Inſtitutions, and Directions whence to derive Grace, *&c.* are all to *ſubſerve* our due acceptance of this Offer. 3. If Chriſt had not *proclaimed* Pardon and Life to Sinners, we had not known that theſe were to be obtained by *any* of us. If he had not declared that he gave Pardon and Life to ſuch as *have Faith*, and *none elſe*, we had not been certain whether it were the Believer or Unbeliever were pardoned: If he had not told us he gave Faith and *then* Pardon, there had been no known *Order* of theſe Gifts: If by his Goſpel God had not *offered* Pardon to all *if* they would accept it, *commanding* their acceptance in *order* to it, *promiſing* it upon their acceptance, and *determining* to judg Men as they accepted or refuſed, then there had been *only an order* in giving Faith and then Pardon, but Acceptation had been no *Condition* nor *Righteouſneſs*, nor had Man

Man been *juſtifiable* by it, or *condemnable* to the want of Pardon for rejecting it. 4. Acceptance of offered Salvation, tho a Righteouſneſs ſuppoſeth a *meritng* Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and can be no higher a Righteouſneſs than a *performed* Condition of a Law of *Grace*, by which Benefits already impetrated are given: Which Law differs not from a *Deed of Gift*, but that the Donor expreſſeth a *governing* Authority in the method of applying theſe Bleſſings, and reſolves to *judg* them to whom that Offer is made, by their acceptance or nonacceptance. 5. Our *Right* adjudged upon our acceptation is a Right *of Grace* and Mercy, and tho infallible, it can infer no Claim *of Debt*. 6. This Acceptation is *deſcribed* by the Goſpel, and nothing is an Acceptation upon which we ſhall *receive* the offered Bleſſings, if it be not in its Principle, Nature, Extent, Operativeneſs and Duration, *ſuch* an Acceptation as the *Goſpel* doth promiſe its ſaving Benefits to. 6. Tho this *Acceptation* merit nothing, yet Chriſt's Righteouſneſs being ordained to merit Salvation for ſuch as *ſhall accept* of it, and this Acceptance being the Goſpel-ordained *Condition* of our perſonal Intereſt in that merited Salvation, we can be ſaved without neither of them. 7. To prevent Miſtakes I add, the *Elect* ſhall infallibly be brought *ſavingly* to accept of this Salvation.

6. I conſider God *applying* Pardon, Peace, Adoption, *&c.* to Men that have *accepted* of this Salvation according to the Goſpel-offer. 1. He acts herein as a *Judg*. 2. The Relations he ſtands in are as *Creator* and *Redeemer*; the firſt ceaſeth not, tho the other is ſuperadded. 3. The *Cauſe* is adjuſted by the *Rule* of Judgment deſcribed in §. 8. and this Cauſe *partly* refers to what ſatisfied the offended Creator for this Sinner's *Fault*, and merited Salvation for this *forfeiting* Rebel. Here Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is the only *juſtifying* Righteouſneſs, Faith

hath

hath no place in God's regard, who as *Creator* judgeth in this matter. The Cauſe is *partly* alſo: Is this a true *Accepter* of Salvation, *for whom* Pardon, Peace and Glory were promiſed in the Covenant of Redemption *to Chriſt* in reward of his ſatisfying, meriting Death and Obedience, and *to whom* theſe were promiſed in the *Goſpel?* Here Acceptation is a *Righteouſneſs*, the want whereof Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is not appointed to ſupply; and the adjudging a Man a Believer, intitled to Pardon, Peace and Glory, upon the *Satisfaction* of Chriſt, I call Juſtification active, or the Judg's juſtifying Sentence.

7. I call it a Juſtification at the Creator's and Redeemer's Bar; at the *Creator's Bar*, as far as the Sentence refers to what *vindicated* the Honour of God's violated Law, *ſecured* his governing Authority as our Maker, and *merited* the Bleſſings, before which there was no Pardon, Peace, or Glory for the *Sinner*, tho a Believer, none to be *offered*, none to be had by accepting. Nor is it a needleſs thing that the juſtifying Sentence have an expreſs regard to what that refers to, *viz. Chriſt's Righteouſneſs:* for as it was the alone *Condition* of Chriſt's Impetration of Pardon, Peace and Life for Sinners, ſo when theſe are to be adjudged to the Sinner, the *Honour* of the Creator, of the violated Law, and of Chriſt's Satisfaction, is wiſely provided for by an expreſs acknowledgment of, and reference to *that Righteouſneſs*. I call it a Juſtification at the *Redeemer's Bar*, as far as the Sentence refers to our Acceptation, or *Faith as a Righteouſneſs*; for the unſatisfied *Creator*, who governeth and judgeth by the *Law of Works*, could make no *Offers* of Pardon and Glory to Sinners, if they would accept, nor admit Faith to be a Righteouſneſs; and yet conſidered as a *Redeemer* (as God was, when he had received Satisfaction) he could not again demand a ſatisfying, meriting Righteouſneſs to acquit the Believer now upon;

upon; no nor, unleſs under the Notion of a Redeemer, require Faith as a *proper Condition* of Pardon, *&c.* becauſe in the Covenant of Redemption it was promiſed to Chriſt for Sinners as meerly *deſcribed* by Faith. But God in Chriſt as *Redeemer* could make the Goſpel-offer of Pardon upon condition of Acceptation, injoyning that acceptance, and promiſing thereto the Pardon impetrated by Chriſt; and ſo that *Acceptation* is referred to in the juſtifying Sentence of God in Chriſt *as* Redeemer, as what diſcriminates one Man who obtains the Pardon, according to the Goſpel-Promiſe, from him who is judicially debarred of it.

8. I think they who are altogether for Faith as the only imputed Righteouſneſs in Juſtification, do too much contract the juſtifying Sentence by excluding that diſtinct Reſpect which ought to be to the Satisfaction and meriting Obedience of Chriſt, whereby God as our governing Creator can admit the Abſolution of a Sinner. And they who are altogether for the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt as only imputed in Juſtification, do alſo too much limit the juſtifying Sentence, by excluding the Goſpel-Righteouſneſs of Faith which the Redeemer regards, and by which he judicially diſcriminates who among them, to whom Salvation was offered, ſhall obtain it, and who of them ſhall not obtain it. May theſe Hints contribute to an Agreement between theſe worthy Perſons, at leaſt encline all to Chriſtian Forbearance, I ſhall reckon it worth all my Labour and Sufferings. O that the God of Peace would give us Peace by any *juſt* means!

FINIS.